

## POSTMASTERS.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

John A. Merritt to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and District of Columbia.

## GEORGIA.

Helen D. Longstreet to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Hall and State of Georgia.

## MAINE.

Freeman D. Dearth to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

Montrose E. Hill to be postmaster at Old Orchard, in the county of York and State of Maine.

George D. Libby to be postmaster at Gardiner, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine.

Jenny N. Paine to be postmaster at Eastport, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Charles F. Plumly to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Samuel Atwell to be postmaster at Kingston, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles E. Brady to be postmaster at Sandwich, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

Albert B. Dresser to be postmaster at Needham, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Isa B. Fay to be postmaster at Northboro, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Joseph C. Sheehan to be postmaster at East Bridgewater, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles J. Shepard to be postmaster at Waltham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Elmer Standley to be postmaster at Beverly Farms, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

David D. Streeter to be postmaster at Mount Hermon, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

Susan F. Twiss to be postmaster at Three Rivers, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

Fred D. Walker to be postmaster at Belchertown, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

Marie E. White to be postmaster at South Hadley, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Leon F. Sampson to be postmaster at Hanover, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

## OREGON.

August H. Bender to be postmaster at Myrtle Point, in the county of Coos and State of Oregon.

William M. Brown to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Linn and State of Oregon.

John W. Minto to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Multnomah and State of Oregon.

Charles W. Parks to be postmaster at Roseburg, in the county of Douglas and State of Oregon.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Nathaniel H. Brown to be postmaster at East Greenwich, in the county of Kent and State of Rhode Island.

Hulda J. Fessenden to be postmaster at Saylesville, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

Alvin F. Miller to be postmaster at Valley Falls, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 8, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## BILLS PASSED LAST SESSION.

Mr. WACHTER. Mr. Speaker, I present the following concurrent resolution:

## House concurrent resolution.

Whereas the bill (H. R. 10516) for the relief of Edward J. Farrell passed both Houses at the second session of this Congress, but was enrolled too late to receive the signatures of the presiding officers of the two Houses and be presented to the President of the United States before the adjournment of the said second session; and

Whereas the bill (H. R. 11444) to grant certain lands to the State of Ohio passed both Houses and was signed by the presiding officers thereof, but failed to be presented to the President of the United States before the adjournment of the said second session: Therefore,

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the said bills be, and are hereby, ordered to be reenrolled for the signatures of the presiding officers of the two Houses and for presentation to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Maryland what are these bills?

Mr. WACHTER. They are two bills which passed both Houses at the last session. One of them had received the signature of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, but too late to go to the White House.

Mr. MADDOX. What bill was that? What was the other?

Mr. WACHTER. That was a bill granting certain lands to the State of Ohio.

Mr. MADDOX. I heard that. What was the other?

Mr. WACHTER. The other was a bill for the relief of Edward J. Farrell.

Mr. MADDOX. It is impossible to hear. I think we ought to have an opportunity to hear. I can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WACHTER. The other bill was for the relief of Edward J. Farrell, a citizen of New York State.

Mr. MADDOX. What sort of relief?

Mr. WACHTER. The bills were passed by the House and Senate.

Mr. MADDOX. I understand that. I supposed the gentleman could give us some information.

Mr. SULZER. Just say what the bill is for.

Mr. MADDOX. Yes.

Mr. WACHTER. One was to grant certain lands to the State of Ohio and the other was for the relief of Edward J. Farrell.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let us have the titles of the bills read from the desk. We can not hear.

Mr. WACHTER. I will send the bill up and have it read.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman desires to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10516) for the relief of Edward J. Farrell.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge, and deliver, in the name of the United States of America, to Edward J. Farrell, a deed of quitclaim and release quitclaiming and releasing to said Edward J. Farrell, his heirs and assigns, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the following-described land, under water, in the city of New York and State of New York, namely: Beginning at a point in the northerly line of the Croton Aqueduct appropriation, where the same is intersected by the easterly side of lands taken by the United States Government for the improvement of the Harlem River, and running thence northerly along said easterly side of said lands taken by the United States Government for the improvement of the Harlem River 107.87 feet to the lands of the estate of William B. Ogden; thence westerly along the lands formerly of the estate of William B. Ogden 15.45 feet to the pier and bulkhead line established by the United States Government in 1890; thence southerly along said last-mentioned line 180.43 feet to the lands formerly of the Croton Aqueduct appropriation; thence easterly along said lands 9.59 feet to the point or place of beginning: *Provided*, That the said Edward J. Farrell shall show, by proof satisfactory to the Secretary of War, that he is the owner of the abutting shore.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland who introduced this bill originally?

Mr. WACHTER. The gentleman from New York State, Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. SULZER. It is all right, then. [Laughter.] I know all about it now. It is all right.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to inquire of somebody—the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, if he will answer—if there is any precedent for this sort of business?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not examined into this matter myself, but have conferred with others who have, in whose judgment I have confidence, who state that is within the precedents established. The bill, as I remember, was a bill to remove a clog to the title to a piece of property. I have forgotten the details.

Mr. MADDOX. I do not think I ever heard of anything like this before.

Mr. PAYNE. I am satisfied the bill itself ought to pass. This particular question I have not examined.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has the gentleman ever inquired as to whether there is a precedent for this particular way of passing a bill which had passed the last session?

Mr. PAYNE. To settle that, I would make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. It is whether there are precedents for the action on this particular resolution brought in by the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER. This matter was brought to the attention of the Chair a day or two ago. The Chair caused the precedents to be examined. This is the Fifty-eighth Congress, the third session. At the close of the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress both of the bills had passed the House and the Senate.

One of them had received the signature, perhaps, of the Speaker of the House, and also of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, but too late to be presented to the President. They appear to be bills of the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress. The other had passed both House and Senate and was awaiting the signature of the presiding officers. In other words, nothing remained to be done except to submit the bills to the President, except the formal fact of signing the bills, as to one of them, by the Speaker and by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Now, the precedents show, if the Chair recollects aright—one or two in the Thirty-fifth Congress and one, possibly, in the Fifty-fourth—that this course was pursued. Following the precedents, the Chair recognized the gentleman from the Committee on Enrolled Bills to offer a concurrent resolution for the action of the House. Without this action the bills probably would fail. The Chair, however, is not clear as to that point, because this is the same Congress. As it appears now, the enrollment would be defective, because this is the third session instead of the second session of the Congress.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 910. An act granting a pension to Frank L. Phalen;

S. 1283. An act for the relief of William H. Crawford;

S. 1786. An act restoring James G. Field, naval surgeon, to the line of promotion; and

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of James B. Angell on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

#### Senate concurrent resolution 73.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving Grays River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 74.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving Swinomish Slough, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 75.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the mouth of Grays Harbor, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 76.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the entrance of Roche Harbor, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 77.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Lewis River and branches, in the State of Washington, to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 78.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Cowlitz River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce, and to submit plans and estimate of cost of providing a depth of 16 feet of water at low tide between the mouth of said river and the city of Kelso.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 79.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Skagit River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce by the construction of the so-called Sterling cut-off.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 80.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Ilwaco, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 81.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Anacortes, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 82.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an

examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Everett, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce.

#### SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate resolutions and bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 910. An act granting a pension to Frank L. Phalen—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1786. An act restoring James G. Field, naval surgeon, to the line of promotion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1283. An act for the relief of William H. Crawford—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of James B. Angell on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on the Library.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 73:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Grays River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 74:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving Swinomish Slough, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 75:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the mouth of Grays Harbor, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 76:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the entrance to Roche Harbor, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 77:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Lewis River and branches in the State of Washington to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 78:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Cowlitz River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce, and to submit plans and estimate of cost of providing a depth of 16 feet of water at low tide between the mouth of said river and the city of Kelso—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 79:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the Skagit River, Washington, to meet the demands of commerce, by the construction of the so-called "Sterling cut-off"—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 80:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Ilwaco, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 81:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Anacortes, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### Senate concurrent resolution 82:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and an estimate submitted of the cost of improving the harbor of Everett, Wash., to meet the demands of commerce—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. FORSTER, one of his secretaries:



## LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

*The Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering statements showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, and October, 1904, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 7, 1904.

The message and accompanying document were referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and ordered to be printed.

## LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move you, sir, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15895) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if there is any desire for debate on his side of the House?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have had no applications for time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to reserve all points of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. They have been reserved.

The SPEAKER. They have been reserved.

The motion of Mr. BINGHAM was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, while it may seem somewhat unusual to present one of the important appropriation bills at this early date in the session, it is proper that the House should be advised that, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee of the full Committee on Appropriations assembled a week before the convening of Congress, all the members of the subcommittee being present, and were enabled to report the bill from the subcommittee to the full committee yesterday. Throughout the deliberations of your subcommittee all were present, and the bill comes from the subcommittee unanimously reported. I may say that the paragraphs in the bill might also be marked "Current law." In my long experience I have never seen a bill presented with as few changes, as compared with the bill itself and current law, as this bill exhibits.

The estimates of the Departments, however, required a thorough investigation on the part of your committee, and all parties who were supposed to represent the increases in the bill were called before your subcommittee. The print covers a very large number of pages, but the most important particular for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole is the fact that the estimates for the next fiscal year from the Book of Estimates, on pages 9 to 89 and 111 to 121 of the Book of Estimates for 1906, aggregate \$29,685,207.84, of which amount there is recommended in the bill \$28,838,709.84. Appropriations for the same purposes for the current fiscal year, including \$44,570 carried in the sundry civil, deficiency, and other acts, aggregated \$28,602,828.22, being \$235,881.62 less than is recommended in the accompanying bill for the service of the fiscal year 1906, and being a decrease from the estimates of \$846,498. In other words, to make it clear, we have decreased the estimates upward of \$800,000 and we have added to the bill but \$235,000 more than the current law. In other words, we might have submitted to the House almost the current law, so far as the sum totals are concerned.

We called upon the War Department, in the current law, for the classification, both as to class and clerks as well as compensation, of that body of men in that Department that has heretofore been carried on what is called the "temporary roll," a

roll which was a result of the war with Spain. In the first fiscal year in which that temporary force was allowed, 1899, the temporary roll, which was a roll subject to the discretion of the Secretary of War both as to assignment and duty and compensation, amounted to \$507,000. It was increased for 1900 to \$600,000, and since has been annually reduced until the current year, 1905, it has been brought down to \$360,000. We have put this requirement in the bill for the current law, that for the ensuing year—meaning the next fiscal year of 1906—specific estimates should be submitted for all employments thereunder in number and rate of compensation not in excess of the number and compensation actually being paid during the current year.

In other words, that fund which has been heretofore fully under the discretion of the Secretary of War, we enjoin that there shall be no increase over the present number nor any increase in compensation. That has been complied with by the War Department, resulting in this, that there is a reduction of 34 employees and a reduction of \$27,820 in the total amount of compensation carried.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the necessity for a lump-sum appropriation? Why not distribute it out so that we may know just what it is for?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is exactly what we have done. In the bill under consideration, what has been called the "temporary roll" heretofore, under instruction the appropriation for the current year has been taken up by the War Department and assigned to a specific line of duty; the clerk's salary is fixed for the next fiscal year, and there is no increase in number or places.

Mr. LLOYD. As I understand it, there is a lump sum appropriated.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no; we give the details.

Mr. LLOYD. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. I understood there was a lump sum appropriated.

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no lump sum appropriated.

Mr. LLOYD. We ought not to have any lump-sum appropriations anywhere.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not in this Department.

Mr. LLOYD. Not in any Department. There is no lump sum appropriated. Each salary is specified, and there is no increase in the number, and no change in the salaries.

Mr. BINGHAM. It will also be noted that an apparent increase of 59 in the number of salaries is made in the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, all of which have heretofore been paid from the general appropriations, made first in 1900 in the sum of \$650,000 and gradually reduced to the sum of \$250,000 for the current fiscal year. That was also a part of the temporary force in connection with the change of laws running to the Internal Revenue Department, and under the construction of the current law, giving up his discretion of \$250,000 and locating that force in the general office throughout the country or wherever it may have been necessary heretofore to pay out of the fund of \$250,000, we have taken the whole proposition of the Internal Revenue Department and readjusted it on the lines suggested by the Commissioner, who is accepted by the House as a careful official, and have been able to handle that whole proposition with an increase of \$9,700.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to please state in a concise way the new legislation in the bill, so that we may all understand it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes. There is, Mr. Chairman, therefore, an actual net increase in the number of salaries proposed in the bill of 164 over the number now provided by law. I am now on page 2 of the report, and any gentleman having the report in his hand can follow me. I would say that in so far as that declaration is concerned the large body of this seeming increase of force runs to the Civil Service Commission. General Black appeared before the commission, and his hearings are complete in the printed book of hearings. He submitted a new organization for his commission. Heretofore he has had full liberty and the broadest freedom under the general statute organizing the commission of making draft upon any of the Departments here or elsewhere throughout the country for the work of the commission. We found in his statement a fair proposition that appealed to your committee. There has never been a proper exhibit for some years past of what the expenses of the Civil Service Commission were. We thought two years ago that we would handle the proposition when we said to the commission, "You have so many detailed clerks," and the commission responded: "But they fail to come up to the standards of efficiency. Under the law we ask a Department for subordinate clerical force and the Department exercises its own judgment, and as a rule contributes to the work of this commission perhaps their poorest clerical force."

Now, the commission has felt that that was not fair. There-

fore, instead of allowing the detail to go on, we ordered the detail back to the Departments and granted the commissioner all of his requests, up to the last cent. We are now confronted with the proposition that the large inflow on account of the rural free delivery throughout the country has so burdened and so enlarged their field of operations that they have been forced to organize a system other and different from that which they have heretofore operated. Now, the proposition is this: Let us in the future come to Congress and ask Congress specifically annually for the needed requirements and force in connection with a good, wise administration in the conduct of the work of the commission. Not only that, but the same with reference to the rural free delivery. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are to-day detailed from the various Departments of the Government in the Civil Service Commission a permanent or continuing detail of fifty-six of the subordinate force of the different Departments here, as well as the post-offices and custom-houses throughout the country. We said to General Black, in effect, "We will take your recommendation to the House, giving you all that you have asked, in order that your administration of this commission shall show in the future its expenditure; but at the same time we want from you some declaration that you will not avail yourself of the broad provisions of the statute that organized your commission and continue to make your details from the Departments of the Government." I will say that General Black assured us—and I think I remember his words—that during his administration certainly he would guarantee that he would keep in good faith the action of the committee, and if indorsed by the Congress it would be his labor to endeavor to carry out that which the committee seemed to think a wise way for him to do his work. I hope I have made myself clear on that proposition.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I understand from the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] that the clerks in the Civil Service Commission, ordered chiefly on detail, are to be transferred back to their original Departments. Now, this bill provides for the employment of additional clerks for the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BINGHAM. To correspond and in accordance with their wish, sending back the details now on the force to the respective Departments.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If other Departments could have afforded to permit the temporary detail of these clerks, they do not need them in their own service?

Mr. BINGHAM. We have tried to correct that throughout the bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will not the effect of this bill be to increase the number of public officers correspondingly by requiring the Civil Service Commission to employ directly for its own service and to turn back this clerical force to the Departments which have been able to spare them for the civil service administration?

Mr. BINGHAM. Now with reference to that question, I will come right to the commission—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And would it not be better to provide these clerks detailed to remain there permanently as civil service clerks in order that there might not be an excess of offices more than the service requires?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no doubt we have throughout the bill endeavored to correct the matter of details as far as we could. We now give the civil service what the civil service asks. First comes the presumption as to whether the commission will not take care of these people themselves under their own right.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Can they under the provisions of this bill? They are clerks now regularly employed in other Departments of the service, and, as provided on page 35 of this bill, they shall not be transferred. They must therefore be returned to their proper Department and the commission must employ a new and adequate force, and therefore it seems to me you have a surplus force of public officers.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that there are fifty of these clerks detailed to the Civil Service Commission and that there are six clerks of their own force now doing this work. We are able to trace where twenty of these clerks came from so as to be able to take them out where they are specifically provided for, particularly in the Post-Office Department; but all through this bill—and I am sure the chairman will make an explanation of that in connection with the Pension Bureau—wherever we could find a Department where the force was supernumerary or they could give details in large blocks or any considerable number to other bureaus or other Departments, we have reduced the force in that Department from which the details came.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. So you have provided for it?

Mr. LITTAUER. In this way: we have reduced the number of clerks in other Departments, particularly the Post-Office Department, whence came a large number of these clerks.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. So you have had in view the return of these clerks?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes, sir. Now, as to the question as to whether or not these clerks should be retained where they are at work. This work is new work they are doing. The field work, as an incident, comes because of reorganization of the work of the Civil Service Commission and better service and more uniform examinations and quicker return to these people for civil-service positions. That is the argument they made us recommending this permanent force. We believe these people have only been detailed there for one or two years. We believe the necessary force, selecting out as many of those as they wish for and ask after the transfer of this new and permanent force, will be better than detailing them in blocks and continuing them in the positions that they occupy temporarily.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. So that practically provides against a supernumerary force in any Department?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes; and we have tried to provide for an efficient force for the work of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the thing I want to be advised upon.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, at this point, of my colleague, the chairman of the committee, this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask whether this bill does not create twenty-three new employees to the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of examining rural carriers?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman in reply—I was going to follow my remarks with that after the remarks of my colleague on the committee—that in this reorganization scheme rural free delivery is made a division in connection with the work of the commission. They have divided the country into thirteen districts. In these thirteen districts, or throughout the country, a body or force numbering twenty-three were detailed from the various departments located throughout the country to do that rural free delivery examination work. We turn every one of that subordinate force back to the respective lines of work in the departments—customs, post-offices, etc.—throughout the country, and we give the Civil Service Commission the right to appoint twenty-three new men, so that we relegate back the whole force now detailed from the Post-Office Department in what is called permanent relation with the Civil Service Commission to the original places in the respective departments throughout the country, and allow them to go on with the organization on the basis of the division of the country into thirteen districts.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Do you increase, then, the aggregate administrative force—the number of employees—by the number that you authorize the Civil Service Commission to employ?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. You increase the number that much?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes, sir; to be located with the work that they have now in the Post-Office Department, customs, internal revenue, etc.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. They will have nothing to do but continue these examinations?

Mr. LITTAUER. They will have nothing to do but to continue these examinations just the same as the detailed clerks do now.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield to a question, and tell us where these clerks are now located?

Mr. BINGHAM. There are located throughout the country about 1,200 civil-service boards, made up in the small districts of the postmaster and such assistants as he gets from near-by places, and the location is indicated where examinations may be taken. We give them twenty-three men in the future, as carried in this bill, to make the supervision throughout the country, where the rural free delivery runs, and the details are made just as the requirements increase for that service, which falls upon the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand you to mean that the local supervision is to be condemned?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no; not in any form whatever. They claim that it is better and wiser for the efficiency of the service.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Where are these twenty-three people located?

Mr. BINGHAM. They are to be located in the big centers. They are to be sent from their particular locations to other places to supervise the examinations held.



Mr. LITTAUER. I would like to state to the gentleman that the country has been divided into thirteen districts, and we have allowed one superintendent at the head of each of the thirteen districts, so as to bring about uniformity.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. But you have allowed twenty-three.

Mr. LITTAUER. That would be thirteen throughout the country and the rest of the clerical force here at New York or Boston or Chicago. You may need two or three at Chicago at any time. This way, it is believed, is a much more satisfactory way of doing the work, and will do away with many of the little abuses that have been charged as occurring in the conduct of civil-service examinations.

Mr. BINGHAM. General Black, the chief of the Bureau, was most earnest in presenting this, and he believed that if Congress would indorse the scheme the future administration would be far more satisfactory than the old system. This will bring the yearly statement of every year's appropriation, so that everyone will know just exactly what the civil service is doing. Now, I will read this limitation upon the legislation:

During the fiscal year nineteen hundred and six it shall not be lawful to detail clerks or other employees from the Executive Departments or other Government establishments in Washington, District of Columbia, to the Civil Service Commission for the performance of duty in the District of Columbia.

That will be the limitation. That is what the Civil Service Commission recommends. I know that they can under the provisions of the general statute make details from the Departments.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why does it limit that prohibition to the fiscal year 1906? Why not make it permanent?

Mr. BINGHAM. We deemed it a little wiser to make it run for the current year rather than make a radical inroad in the statute. They have the right ad libitum to make details on the reorganization under that statute.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Only technically.

Mr. BINGHAM. We think the best policy was to let it run the year. We do not think, while there might be some gentlemen of the House who would be willing to make such a radical inroad into the organization, it would be wise to limit it, and make it run for the year, as they have requested, and we will see what the experiment proves.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the policy of recommending it is right, but I would like to know why you do not make this prohibition of details permanent. If it is good for one year, I do not see why it would not be well to make it general and permanent.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not think it is subject to the criticism of some gentlemen of the House with reference to the civil service. Many would object to making it permanent, and it would provoke the point of order.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman one more question in connection with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BINGHAM. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. I think I saw a report that a new estimate had been sent to the committee in reference to the additional clerks for the examination of applicants under the Isthmian Canal Commission. May I ask the gentleman whether it is his intention—

Mr. BINGHAM. That estimate has not reached the committee. I saw the published statement myself and made inquiry about it.

Mr. MANN. So far as the gentleman now knows, is it his intention to offer any amendment upon the floor in reference to that matter?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not to this bill, as I am informed, because it has not reached us. One other matter in reference to the Isthmian Canal Commission. As it is to be hereafter under the War Department, we have transferred the adjustment of the accounts of that commission to the Auditor of the War Department.

Mr. HULL. I notice on page 78 of the bill the following provision:

It shall not be lawful to detail clerks or other civilian employees authorized for the office of the General Staff for duty, temporary or otherwise, in any office or bureau of the War Department at Washington, D. C., or to detail clerks or other employees from the War Department for service in the office of the General Staff.

My understanding is that the gentleman—

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say in regard to that—

Mr. HULL. Just one minute. My understanding—and I want to have that understood—is that the committee this year had left the clerks for the General Staff out of this appropriation bill under the idea that they would be provided for in the military bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. They belong to your committee.

Mr. HULL. That they would be provided for by the Military Committee, in that way stopping any friction between the two committees as to those clerks.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, the General Staff can not ask for details, nor can the War Department make any levies upon that staff.

Mr. HULL. I simply wanted that brought out here now.

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. BINGHAM. With pleasure.

Mr. RIXEY. On page 18—

Mr. BINGHAM. Page 18 of what?

Mr. RIXEY. Of your report, I find that while you have only increased the number of clerks in the Navy Department to a limited extent, you have transferred 152 per diem employees to the annual list, I believe.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say they were taken up last session in the current law. Those were the temporary forces made necessary at the time of the Spanish war. One year prior to the current law we called upon the then Secretary of the Navy, Moody, so to arrange in his next report as to accomplish the absorption of the so-called "temporary force." He absorbed them in detail; they are in the current law, and we have followed it.

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not the reason for that, that they are made annual employees in order to give them their sixty days' leave of absence?

Mr. BINGHAM. That I do not know.

Mr. RIXEY. And that as per diem employees they only got fifteen days.

Mr. BINGHAM. That I can not say. That did not come before us in any form in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. RIXEY. Is not that the reason that this change was pressed before the committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I think not.

Mr. LITTAUER. The only reason is—

Mr. BINGHAM. I will tell the gentleman why, if he will pardon me. We now will have absorbed into the details of general legislation running in the appropriation bills, and especially this one, all the temporary forces heretofore authorized that have been in the War Department, in the Internal Revenue, in the Navy, in all the Departments that were added during the war with Spain. The committee did not in any way take into consideration the fact of the leave of absence. The House determined of its own action to put all that force, after its three or four years of experience, into the civil service.

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to know the fact, though. Is it not true that annual employees in the Navy Department get sixty days' leave of absence while the per diem employees only get fifteen?

Mr. BINGHAM. I think that is so. I am not sure about that, however.

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. The naval bill which is brought in here annually provides for many salaries, and I would like to know what is the line of demarcation between your jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the Naval Committee in regard to the salaries of clerks and officers?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was not aware that the naval bill carried any of the subordinate force of the Navy Department.

Mr. RIXEY. It provides for a great deal.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not in the Navy Department. Of course you cover all the stations and navy-yards, which we do not touch.

Mr. RIXEY. This is simply confined to the Navy Department?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is simply confined to the Navy Department.

Mr. LITTAUER. I feel confident that the gentleman would approve this policy here if he would but take into consideration that this class of clerks we specify now in detail was formerly paid out of a lump sum called the "increase of the Navy."

Mr. BINGHAM. That we have eliminated.

Mr. RIXEY. The point I am making is that probably the reason for this move is to put the per diem employees on the annual roll in order to get sixty days' leave of absence, whereas now they only get fifteen days.

Mr. LITTAUER. I am confident that was not in the mind of Secretary Moody when he advised us to take this course, but it was because he felt that in appropriation bills of this character we should appropriate specifically wherever we could, and eliminate the lump sum, and deprive the Department to as great an extent as possible of having large sums of money with which to engage as many clerks as they desired at salaries they chose to pay them.

Mr. RIXEY. There is another question I would like to ask in this connection. I notice in this bill, I forget what page, there is a lump sum under the control of the bureau chiefs here in Washington, and who have control of the disbursement of those funds.

Mr. BINGHAM. We could not take that up in our bill, because it goes to your bill for the Navy Department; it is in connection with the conduct of the Navy. We only touch the subordinate force and contingent expenses of the Navy Department because it appears in the appropriation.

I assure the gentleman it is not the purpose. When they take up their bill, they can look into that proposition.

Now, if I should be allowed to proceed, in the House of Representatives we have made simply the aggregate increase in money expenditure, because the next session that this bill will run to is a long session of Congress as against the current law, which is the short session. Otherwise no changes are made in the number and compensation of officers and employees of the House, except that in the office of the Clerk the salary of the file clerk is reduced from \$2,750 to \$2,000, and the salary of the messenger in the Chief Clerk's office is increased from \$730 to \$900, and an assistant clerk is given to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. These are all the changes we made in the office of the Clerk. In the Doorkeeper's office the addition of a watchman at \$720 is provided for, and a night watchman is reduced from \$900 to \$720. Three assistants at \$1,000 each and a janitor at \$720 are provided for in the document room, the same being now authorized by current law, and the salary of one laborer for the minority is increased from \$600 to \$720.

The appropriation for miscellaneous items is reduced from \$50,000 to \$25,000, and the use of the appropriation is restricted to purposes other than salaries and labor, and a specific appropriation of \$20,000 is made for special and select committees. In other words, we have decreased that \$5,000 and made a better system of accounting.

In the office of the President, four clerks are provided for at \$2,000 each in lieu of four clerks at \$1,800 each, an additional clerk at \$1,400 is authorized in lieu of one now transferred from the office of the Surgeon-General of the Army, and the salary of \$1,800 for an usher is omitted. So that in effect the Department is not increased in subordinate force.

As to the Civil Service Commission, I have already informed the House. The salary of the secretary is increased from \$2,250 to \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. Why is that?

Mr. BINGHAM. That official is regarded as the most valuable subordinate in the office of the Civil Service Commission. He has been there since the organization of the commission, and, as all of us know who have had business with that department, there have been frequent changes in the body of the commission itself.

Mr. MANN. This gentleman is not Mr. Doyle?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I thought his title was that of chief examiner.

Mr. LITTAUER. Oh, no; and I will say that this gentleman well deserves it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, a specific appropriation is made for 23 employees, with salaries aggregating \$41,000, for the field force of the commission, the same being in lieu of persons now detailed from other branches of the public service; and 23 employees, with salaries aggregating \$26,240, are provided for to constitute the rural carrier examining board, being in place of persons now on detail from the Post-Office Department and the postal service.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Then, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prohibit their further detail, is there? Nor is there anything to prohibit the continued detail of others than these 23?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have already read what the law provides in respect to that, that during the fiscal year 1906 it shall be unlawful to detail clerks or other employees from the Executive Departments or other Government establishments in Washington, D. C., to the Civil Service Commission for the performance of duty in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. But that does not prohibit their detail for the performance of duty outside of the District of Columbia. As I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], these 23 additional clerks were to perform duty outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BINGHAM. We give them those 23 that they ask for in lieu of what they want.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Yes, but that does not prohibit their detailing additional clerks.

Mr. BINGHAM. It prohibits it in accordance with the spirit and disposition of the president of the commission. They will come to Congress hereafter for their increases and decreases,

and they will follow their own recommendations, that are a part of this bill, letter by letter. We make it for only one year.

Mr. LITTAUER. If we were to prevent details outside of the District of Columbia, how would they take care of the organization and reorganization of the twelve hundred and odd boards they have throughout the country?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I do not know; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] said that this provision prohibited their detailing clerks to perform the work here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; what we call "inefficient detail"—that is, filling the Departments here with more clerks than we think they ought to have.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Then, as a matter of fact, there is not anything in this law which prohibits the board detailing clerks from the District of Columbia to perform the same work that these twenty-three additional officials are to perform?

Mr. LITTAUER. The entire twenty-three are not to perform work outside of Washington.

Mr. BINGHAM. All the details in this are consistent with their proposition, and when they come to Congress in the future—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. That is as consistent as any proposition.

Mr. BINGHAM. The only detail that they can make outside of the District of Columbia is a detail for a few days in connection with some examinations for rural free delivery without additional expense to the Government. Is that clear to the gentleman?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It is possibly as clear as anything in that connection can be made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Four additional laborers at \$600 each are provided for in the Department of State. In the Treasury Department there is one clerk at \$1,400 provided for in lieu of clerk at \$1,200. In the office of the chief clerk and superintendent one clerk at \$1,600 is provided for in lieu of a clerk at \$1,400, omitted in the office of the Auditor of the War Department, and an assistant draftsman at \$1,200 is provided for.

*Division of customs.*—An additional clerk at \$1,800 is authorized in lieu of one omitted in the office of the Auditor for the Interior Department.

*Division of printing and stationery.*—An additional clerk at \$1,400 is provided for in lieu of one at that salary omitted in the office of the Auditor for the War Department.

*Office of the Auditor for the War Department.*—A reduction is made of two clerks at \$1,400 each and two clerks at \$900 each, the same having been transferred and provided for in other offices.

*Office of Auditor for the Navy Department.*—An increase is recommended of one clerk at \$1,800, one clerk at \$1,600, two clerks at \$1,400 each, three clerks at \$1,200 each, four clerks at \$1,000 each, and four clerks at \$900 each.

We found the office very much in arrears with its work and—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Which office is that?

Mr. BINGHAM. Auditor for the Navy Department. Then comes the Auditor for the Interior Department.

Mr. BURKE. May I ask the chairman a question? In discontinuing the clerks in the office of the Auditor for the Interior Department and providing for a clerk in the division of customs, did you ascertain whether or not the Auditor of the Interior Department could spare that clerk, or simply assumed, because he had been transferred and was on duty in some other Department, that he was not required in that office?

Mr. LITTAUER. The very fact of his detail was the most conclusive evidence you could get that his services were not required in the office of the Auditor for the Interior Department.

Mr. BURKE. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that these details are often made against the protest of the head of a particular Department, and yet in this particular instance I happen to know that the Auditor has been protesting ever since this clerk has been detailed and demanding that he be detailed to his bureau; that he was a valuable clerk, engaged in work that is very important, and that he has insisted that this clerk be returned to his office. And I also understand that these details are made usually, as I have already stated, against the protest of the head of a particular bureau from which the detail is made.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no doubt of it, but they are under the Secretary's control, and that is just what we are trying to do; we want to stop this matter of details.

Mr. BURKE. I appreciate that.

Mr. BINGHAM. We want each bureau to exhibit its work done with its expense; and, further than that, a clerk familiar with his line of work transferred to another line of work leaves



the line of work with which he is familiar and goes on a new line of work in some other Department, and we consider it bad discipline.

Mr. BURKE. I want to say to the chairman I am in entire sympathy with his desire to stop this, but I think an injustice might be done, and I will think an injustice has been done in some of these particular Departments.

Mr. BINGHAM. *Office of Auditor for the Interior Department.*—A reduction is made of one clerk at \$1,800, the same being transferred to and provided for in the division of customs of the Treasury Department.

*Office of Auditor for the State and other Departments.*—An increase is recommended of two clerks at \$1,400 each and two clerks at \$1,200 each.

*Office of Auditor for the Post-Office Department.*—Two hundred dollars additional is recommended for one clerk of class 4, to be designated assistant chief of assorting and checking division, and an increase is recommended of four clerks at \$1,200 each, six clerks at \$1,000 each, five clerks at \$900 each, and fifteen skilled laborers at \$720 each.

As the gentleman knows, this is one of the very large Departments of the Government, and the reason for the action on the part of the Department is the question of auditing the accounts of the star-route service, which heretofore have had an auditing every three months. They have changed that system, believing better results could be secured by auditing the accounts of the star route every month. That necessitated the change.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I know; but have not the number of star routes greatly decreased since the rural free delivery came in?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no doubt of that, but this increase of clerical force is made because of the change in the system of administration and adjustment of accounts in the Post-Office Department, and while the star-route service has decreased since the rural free delivery came in these star-route accounts will be audited monthly, instead of every three months. That is the reason of the increase.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I have no doubt there is a reason for the increase in the clerks, and I doubt not gentlemen who are acquainted with the conduct of business on the outside could not go in there and devise a system to bring about a decrease in the number of clerks instead of an increase. I do not doubt the ability of the people of the Post-Office Department to devise some system by which it will be necessary to increase the number of clerks and—

Mr. BINGHAM. In the first place, I think this—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. As long as the increase in the number of clerks is encouraged by the Committee on Appropriations in this Congress, why there will be no question at all about the Post-Office Department and other Departments and those employed therein devising new schemes by which additional appointments will be made necessary.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman remembers my statement, he probably will see that there was an increase of a million estimated or submitted to the committee, and we have made a reduction of over \$800,000, leaving an increase of only \$225,000. The gentleman will see that whatever may have been the purpose of some of the Departments, they have not made any impression upon the committee.

*Office of the Treasurer.*—For the force employed in redeeming the national currency an increase is recommended of 1 assistant bookkeeper, at \$2,000; 1 clerk, at \$1,200; 3 expert counters, at \$900 each; 1 expert counter, at \$800, and 5 expert counters, at \$700 each.

*Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.*—The salary of the Deputy Comptroller is increased from \$3,000 to \$3,500.

*Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.*—In lieu of employees now authorized and employed in this office with compensation paid from a general appropriation the following are recommended: Three clerks, at \$1,800 each; 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 3 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 13 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 8 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 17 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, at \$800; 5 assistant messengers, at \$720 each, and 8 laborers, at \$660 each.

The two general appropriations for expenses of collecting internal revenue are increased as follows: The one for salaries and expenses of collectors, etc., from \$1,900,000 to \$2,000,000, and the one for salaries and expenses of agents, etc., from \$2,100,000 to \$2,200,000, and the general appropriation of \$250,000 for additional clerks in the office of the Commissioner and for salaries and expenses of agents is omitted, the net result of the amounts recommended in this bill for the Internal-Revenue Service, including the office of the Commissioner, being an increase of \$9,780.

This covers the entire cost in the temporary organization, which has been absorbed by the regular force of the office, so that

now we have no temporary force, as we had heretofore, authorized in connection with the war. It is not now carried in any of the Departments.

*Office of the Director of the Mint.*—The appropriation for freight on bullion and coin by registered mail or otherwise between mints and assay offices is reduced from \$75,000 to \$40,000.

*Office of the Surgeon-General of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.*—The salary of the private secretary to the Surgeon-General is increased from \$1,600 to \$1,800, and a clerk to the disbursing agent, at \$1,400, is provided for.

#### INDEPENDENT TREASURY.

*Office of the assistant treasurer at Baltimore.*—An increase is recommended of 2 clerks, at \$1,600 each.

*Office of the assistant treasurer at Chicago.*—An increase is recommended of 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each.

*Office of the assistant treasurer at New Orleans.*—The salary of the assistant treasurer is increased from \$4,000 to \$4,500, and a vault clerk, at \$1,800, is recommended.

All the assistant treasurers of the United States get \$4,500 a year as compensation, except the assistant treasurer at New Orleans, who has been running on a basis of \$4,000.

*Office of the assistant treasurer at New York.*—An increase is recommended in the salaries of 5 assistant tellers from \$800 to \$900 each.

*Office of the assistant treasurer at San Francisco.*—The salary of the bookkeeper is reduced from \$2,500 to \$2,250, the chief clerk from \$2,400 to \$2,000; the salary of the assistant cashier is increased from \$2,000 to \$2,400, and the salary of the first teller from \$2,000 to \$2,250, and provision is made for 1 additional clerk at \$1,500.

#### MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

*Mint at Carson, Nev.*—The appropriation for wages of workmen and watchmen is reduced from \$5,600 to \$3,600.

*Mint at Denver, Colo.*—Appropriations are recommended for salaries of 18 officers and employees in the general staff for operation of the mint at salaries aggregating \$37,450, being an increase of 7 employees with compensation aggregating \$12,200, and the appropriation for wages of workmen and adjusters is increased from \$22,000 to \$115,000.

#### GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES.

Appropriations are recommended for government in the several Territories as authorized by law, the aggregate being reduced \$64,750 under the appropriations for the current year, owing to the fact that appropriations are not required for biennial sessions of the legislatures in Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma the coming fiscal year.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT.

The general appropriation of \$360,000 for continuing the employment of additional temporary clerks and others is omitted, specific provision being made under estimates submitted by the Department as required by law, enacted at the last session of Congress, for employees in each of the several bureaus of the Department, in accordance with the numbers now employed and the rates of compensation now paid from the general fund, the total number of employees thus taken up and specifically provided for being 290. The consolidation of the Record and Pension Office and the Adjutant-General's Office under the new Military Secretary's Office, authorized by a law enacted at the last session, is effected, and by a rearrangement of the clerical force recommended by the Military Secretary, a reduction is made of 34 clerks and employees, with salaries aggregating \$27,820.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

The salary of an assistant engineer in the office of the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds is increased from \$1,800 to \$2,400, and the general appropriation of \$35,000 for the employment of overseers and others is made available for the payment of the chief clerk and a clerk and stenographer in the Office.

#### STATE, WAR, AND NAVY DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

The salary of one electrician is increased from \$1,000 to \$1,200, and four mistresses of charwomen at \$300 each are provided for in lieu of four charwomen at \$240 each.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT.

*Bureau of Navigation.*—One clerk, at \$1,000, is omitted by transfer to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

*Hydrographic Office.*—One clerk, at \$1,400, is omitted and transferred to the Bureau of Steam Engineering, and the salaries of 6 apprentices are increased \$100 each.

*Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.*—A chief clerk, at \$2,000, is provided for in lieu of a civilian assistant, at \$2,500, and 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 1 clerk, at \$1,400; 1 clerk, at \$1,200, and 1 messenger boy, at \$420 are omitted, the same being no longer borne on the rolls of the Bureau.

*Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.*—An increase is made of 1 clerk, at \$1,000, and 1 assistant messenger, at \$720.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

*Pension Office.*—A reduction in the force is made as follows: One clerk, at \$1,800; 10 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 8 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 8 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 5 copyists, at \$900 each; 1 engineer, at \$1,200; 6 messengers, at \$840 each, and 1 laborer, at \$660, the same being no longer employed in or required for the service of the Bureau. A reduction is also made of 25 special examiners at \$1,300 each, and the appropriation for per diem and expenses of special examiners is reduced from \$400,000 to \$350,000.

#### POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

*Office of the Postmaster-General.*—A foreman of laborers, at \$800, is provided for in lieu of 1 laborer, at \$660.

*Office of the purchasing agent.*—The salary of the purchasing agent authorized at the last session of Congress, at \$4,000, is provided for, together with the following in his office: Chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 clerk, at \$1,800; 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 1 clerk, at \$1,400; 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 assistant messenger, at \$720, and for actual and necessary traveling expenses, \$500.

We have now in that office, doing work by transfer from the First Assistant's office, five or six clerks. They are going to reorganize the office of purchasing agent. Very large contracts are considered, and the office requires this subordinate force; but they will be transferred and go back to their places in the departments, having been only temporarily assigned to this division.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The First Assistant's office did not suffer from the detail of these men.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is a necessity of the Department. These few men were duly detailed from the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General in order that the purchasing agent might fully go on with his work. We now send them back, and they have only been away from the First Assistant Postmaster-General's office a few months.

*Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General.*—The salary of the assistant superintendent of railway adjustments is increased from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and an increase is made of 2 clerks, at \$1,800; 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 2 clerks, at \$1,400 each, and 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each.

Everybody knows how careful the Second Assistant Postmaster-General is, not only in the administration of the general work but in all its features.

*Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General.*—The salary of the superintendent of postage-stamp supplies and postmasters' accounts is increased from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and an increase is made of 5 clerks at \$1,200 and 5 clerks at \$1,000 each.

*Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.*—An increase is recommended of 3 clerks, at \$1,600 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,200 each, and 19 clerks, at \$1,000 each, and a reduction is made of 18 clerks, at \$900 each. On account of transfers made to the Civil Service Commission a reduction is made as follows: Chief of board of examiners of rural carriers, \$2,250; 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 1 clerk, at \$1,400; 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 8 clerks, at \$900 each, and 2 assistant messengers, at \$720 each.

*Office of the topographer.*—Salaries are increased as follows: The topographer, from \$2,750 to \$3,000; 1 map mounter, from \$1,200 to \$1,400; 2 copyists of maps, from \$900 to \$1,000 each, and provision is made for 1 assistant topographer, at \$2,000.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Provision is made for 1 confidential clerk to the Attorney-General, at \$1,600.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

*Office of the Secretary.*—An increase is recommended of 1 confidential clerk to the Secretary, at \$1,600; 1 chief of division, at \$2,000; 3 clerks, at \$1,800 each; 5 clerks, at \$1,600 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 captain of the watch, at \$1,200; 1 skilled laborer, at \$840; 2 laborers, at \$660 each; 5 charwomen, at \$240 each, and the salaries of 2 telegraph operators are increased from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each, and an appropriation of \$10,000 is recommended for the compensation and expenses of a specialist or specialists, to be selected and appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to make investigations regarding manner of conduct of public business in the various bureaus of that Department.

The investigation by specialists has been made as a direct request by the Secretary of the Department; and while perhaps the amount of \$10,000 may not be amply sufficient, we think it safe to start with, on the basis of the statement he made, that he wants a thorough investigation regarding manner of conduct of public business in the various bureaus of his Department, the appointment being made outside of the civil service.

*Bureau of Corporations.*—A reduction is made of 1 special attorney, at \$4,000, and the appropriation for compensation and per diem of special attorneys, special examiners, special agents, and expenses of employees of the Bureau detailed for duty is increased from \$61,300 to \$100,000.

*Bureau of Manufactures.*—A reduction is made of 1 chief clerk, at \$2,000; 1 clerk, at \$1,800; 1 clerk, at \$1,400; 1 clerk at \$1,200; 1 clerk, at \$1,000; 1 clerk, at \$900; 1 messenger, at \$840; 1 assistant messenger, at \$720; 1 messenger boy, at \$480, and 2 laborers, at \$660 each.

I will state, gentlemen, that the Secretary of Commerce made the statement before our committee that there was no organization whatever as yet of the bureau known as the Bureau of Manufactures.

*Light-House Board.*—An increase is recommended of 1 clerk, at \$1,000; 1 clerk, at \$900, and 1 messenger boy, at \$480.

*Census Office.*—An increase is recommended of 28 clerks, at \$1,200 each, and 13 clerks, at \$1,000 each, and a reduction is recommended of 14 clerks, at \$900 each. The appropriation for securing information for census reports provided for by law, including per diem and expenses of special agents, is increased from \$438,400 to \$500,000.

We make that appropriation immediately available for the reason that the Census Office must make their report on manufactures on the 1st of July next.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be extended as much as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended without limit. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BINGHAM. *Bureau of Navigation.*—The salary of the Commissioner of Navigation is increased from \$3,600 to \$4,000.

*Bureau of Immigration.*—An increase is recommended of 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 copyist, at \$900, and 1 messenger at \$840.

*Bureau of Standards.*—An increase is recommended as follows: One assistant physicist, at \$1,600; 1 assistant chemist, at \$1,600; 1 assistant physicist, at \$1,400; 1 laboratory assistant, at \$1,000; 2 aids, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, at \$540; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 elevator boy, at \$360; chief mechanic, at \$1,600; 1 assistant engineer, at \$1,000; 1 fireman, at \$720, and 1 female laborer at \$360. The salary of the storekeeper is increased from \$900 to \$1,000, and that of the engineer from \$1,500 to \$1,800.

I come now to the amendments of the bill. I have read, I think, twice to the House that which has reference to the Civil Service Commission, and as that matter has been fully explained to the House I will not comment on it further.

On page 45, after line 22, is the following:

Hereafter the accounts for the Isthmian Canal Commission shall be audited by the Auditor for the War Department.

That seems to be settled as the policy of the Administration.

On page 78, after line 14, is the following:

It shall not be lawful to detail clerks or other civilian employees authorized for the Office of the General Staff for duty, temporary or otherwise, in any office or bureau of the War Department at Washington, District of Columbia, or to detail clerks or other employees from the War Department for service in the Office of the General Staff.

That I have read in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

On page 146, in connection with the Bureau of Immigration, is the following:

That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, shall have power to refund head tax heretofore and hereafter collected under section 1 of the immigration act approved March 3, 1903, upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that such collection was erroneously made.

I will simply state to the gentlemen that these are generally refund of head tax, are small sums of two, four, or six dollars, and when submitted under statute takes about five or six months to conclude; and under the legislation, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the immigrant can receive the refund of his head tax in a very short time.

We come to a paragraph in the bill which relates to incapacitated employees. On page 155, section 3, is made applicable to employees of the Government "incapacitated," instead of "incapacitated otherwise than temporarily."

We had some discussion in the committee concerning this proposed change, and your committee, in making the change, have had but one purpose; that is, to try and reach out and see if we can not find a satisfactory conclusion to the continuance in the Departments of men permanently incapacitated, where,



through the charity or good heart or whatever you may see proper to call it of the officer in administration over the unfortunate subordinate, who doubtless has been worn out in the service, this employee is retained. We want to try and get such verbiage whereby the incapacitated clerk can be dropped. We think this draws the line a little more closely than heretofore. To what extent the present law has been carried your committee has been unable to ascertain; but in some of the Departments there have been men who have been receiving sixteen or eighteen hundred dollars, who, perhaps the greater part of their lives, have been most efficient in their line of work. A man of this sort becomes, with years or other infirmities, unable to do a very high class of clerical work or work in the line in which he has been employed. He is reduced to ten or twelve hundred dollars, which is simply a temporary expedient to allow that man to make a fair return in the way of work for a limited compensation. We think, perhaps, that the amendment we submit will be more effective in the administration of the offices than the verbiage now used in current law.

As to the following, we were of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] covered the full ground of a prevention or a stoppage of the use of horses, wagons, and carriages by the Departments, other than those exempted by statute or current law. There is a provision that was inserted as a paragraph in the sundry civil bill which extended the law to the like uses of horses and carriages for private purposes and intended to accomplish the same end as the paragraph in the legislative bill. We have therefore grouped the two together, and hope that with that grouping we will reach the wish of this House in a limitation of what seemed heretofore to have been perhaps a violation of the intent of the law. It is as follows:

Sec. 4. No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used for purchasing, maintaining, driving, or operating any carriage or vehicle (other than those specifically authorized and named for personal purposes in section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1905, and other than those used for transportation of property belonging to or in the custody of the United States), for the official use of any officer or employee of any of the Executive Departments or other Government establishments at Washington, D. C., unless the same shall be specifically authorized by law or provided for in terms by appropriation of money, and all such carriages and vehicles so procured and used for official purposes shall have conspicuously painted thereon at all times the full name of the Executive Department or other branch of the public service to which the same belong and in the service of which the same are used.

We have simply used a grouping of the two paragraphs contained first in the legislative bill and second in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman on the other side [Mr. LIVINGSTON] desire any time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want a little time just now myself.

Mr. BINGHAM. With pleasure. The gentleman is welcome to as much as he desires.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, it has been impossible under the circumstances, with all this confusion, to hear the explanations made by the gentleman in charge of the bill. It is nearly always the case, in the consideration of appropriation bills in a short session, that there is this lack of attention; and I am surprised that Members of the House who have to vote upon a bill carrying \$28,000,000 and more are not silent and quiet, so that an explanation of the bill can be made in a general way. I know it is impossible to do it with the confusion that we have in the House, and I do not propose now to undertake it after the gentleman has tried it and could not be heard across the aisle 10 feet away.

I want to say to the Members of the House that if you will take the report that accompanies this bill and follow the report closely with the bill in the reading under the five-minute rule it is the only possible way that you will be enabled to comprehend what this committee has presented to the House. There is a little summary at the last of the report that will give you some idea of it.

The increase, for instance, in the number of salaries in 1906 over those for 1905 was 645. The net increase in the amount of this bill over the appropriation for 1905 is \$235,881.62. That is the increase in the total appropriation. The net increase in the number of salaries over the bill for 1905 is 513.

Now, in this bill will develop where these increases are and what they are and what they are for, and there you can stop and ascertain absolutely the reason for those increases, and it is about the only way you can get at it. I might give it to you now, but you would forget it before the bill is finished. The only way for Members of the House to see what we are appropriating is to follow the bill closely under the five-minute rule and demand explanation when you do not understand what the appropriations are for. Now, you will find in the hearings, on page 11—

Mr. MADDOX. Right there, if the gentleman will allow

me, I want to ask my colleague, and not only him but the gentleman who has charge of the bill, why it is that we can not get a copy of these hearings? I have twice sent for them and have been refused both times. I would like to find out the reason.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are not public documents.

Mr. MADDOX. Well, admit that they are not public documents.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will say that I am surprised that my colleague could not get hold of a copy for his own use.

Mr. MADDOX. I have sent twice to get a copy and my colleague has sent once, and the messenger comes back and says that the clerk refuses to let them go out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, while there was so much confusion on the floor there was something said about 13 new clerks sent up by the Post-Office Department, into which the Civil Service Bureau intends to put their fingers. You will find that all in the hearings. I asked the question myself, "What do you propose to do there?" They said, "We propose to establish an independent body; it is not proper for the Post-Office Department to examine their own clerks." That may be true; it may be right and proper; and I said, "Then what? If the rural carrier in my district is examined by the agent and that is sent up to the local board in Washington they send it down to you, do they not?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Why not observe that course now?" He said, "We want a go-between in there; we want some man in your district and in all that division that will take an oversight of this matter before it comes up to the Post-Office Department." Now, you will find in the hearings all the reasons that he gave for that proposition.

There is some new legislation, Mr. Chairman. For instance, you passed an act a year ago authorizing the appointment of a purchasing agent for the Post-Office Department. We in this bill make him a little bureau by giving him a few clerks. There is another thing that is new. We take down the Bureau of Manufactures, except the chief himself, take away all his clerks. He never organized and never did anything, and there is no prospect of his doing anything under these limitations that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just spoken about. Some of them are drastic. They are in the report, and you can scan them when we get to them in the bill; and if you do not understand them now, you can get a full explanation if the Chairman of the House can keep order on the floor long enough for you to get it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are no other gentlemen on either side of the House that desire to discuss the bill, I move that the bill be read under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate having closed, the Clerk will report the bill by paragraph.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk of printing records, \$2,220; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$3,000, and \$1,000 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$2,220; messenger, to be appointed by the committee, \$1,440; clerk and stenographer to the Committee on Finance, \$2,500; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Claims, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Commerce, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Pensions, \$2,220; two assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on the District of Columbia, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Foreign Relations, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Engrossed Bills, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Joint Committee on the Library, \$2,220; clerks to the committees on Naval Affairs, Census, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Public Buildings and Grounds, Agriculture and Forestry, Education and Labor, Territories, Interstate Commerce, Public Health and National Quarantine, Private Land Claims, Patents, Coast Defenses, Privileges and Elections, Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, Rules, Civil Service and Retrenchment, Enrolled Bills, Geological Survey, Railroads, Pacific Railroads, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Philippines, Relations with Cuba, Inter-oceanic Canals, Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries, Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments, and clerk to conference minority of the Senate, at \$2,220 each; clerks to committees on Woman Suffrage, and Mines and Mining, at \$2,100 each; in all, \$127,760.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Has this Committee on Woman Suffrage ever had a meeting?

Mr. LITTAUER. Our committee has not been informed, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, that committee is in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I do not care where it is now. What I want to know is whether it ever meets, and, if it does meet, what use it has for a clerk.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CLARK] that that is a provision of the bill about which we have never made any investigation.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I think the committee had one meeting in 1902.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has been in the House long enough to have witnessed at different times long controversies, running sometimes through several days, with reference to what the Senate has asked for and what the House thought they should have, and what the House has asked for and what the Senate thought the House should have; and he well knows that it has been the practice of the House for some years to accede to the request of the Senate in that respect. That is a question which has been eliminated from discussion for some years, and it has been our practice to take the recommendations of the Senate as to the conduct of their business as well as their own comfort in respect to that branch of the legislative part of the Government.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, what I want to find out is this, Must the House agree to everything that the Senate claims?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that the House has acceded to everything except, I think, one suggestion with reference to the contingent accounts, and I would state that that is a tentative proposition on the part of the House. We find that out of their contingent fund they employ a body of laborers that we think should be put in an appropriation of distinct form, not contingent—something of the same division which we have made with reference to what is called miscellaneous accounts in the House. Now, we ask for \$50,000 in the House and we divide that and appropriate half of it—\$20,000 or \$25,000—for miscellaneous items, and \$20,000 for expenses of the House in connection with special committees, funerals, etc. We think the Senate may accede to that proposition, but I am free to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that I think the Senate will endeavor to adhere to their policy of the past, something with which the gentleman is familiar. I say in frankness to the gentleman that we have made no investigation, nor do we expect the Senate to make any investigation into the House subordinate force, not only in practice, but in compensation, for the wise conduct of the business of the House.

Mr. CLARK. Well, Mr. Chairman, what has become of this great hullabaloo that has been going on here about making the House independent of the Senate? I have heard a heap of talk about that thing, but I have never heard of anything being done. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if a point of order lies against that man's salary, and if it does I desire to make it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that it is current law.

Mr. CLARK. If it is current law a point of order does not lie against it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall have to object to the point of order, on the ground that it is current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair if a point of order lies against the item of \$2,100 for a clerk to the Woman Suffrage Committee of the Senate, and if it does I desire to make the point.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Missouri will make the point of order, the Chair will rule upon it.

Mr. CLARK. Very well; I will make the point of order, and that will settle it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would simply state, in reference to the gentleman's point of order, that this is in accordance with current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that these clerks are provided for by arrangements in the Senate—the committees and the clerks. Is that the fact?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the gentleman's point of order as against that paragraph of the section of the bill to which he has referred does not lie, because it is current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For thirty annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at \$1,500 each, \$45,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill some questions on this item embraced in lines 18 to 20 in regard to thirty annual clerks to Senators. I see an item here in regard to clerks who shall be clerks of committees, but I do not know what they want with thirty annual clerks without any further explanation.

Mr. BINGHAM. I can only answer the gentleman it is current law and has been for years.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would make the point of order against it.

Mr. BINGHAM. We accept the estimates of the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It does not mean anything; that is my objection to it. I think they should state some reason for asking for these clerks.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is a force subordinate in the Senate that has been employed for some years. It is in the current law and we have accepted current law.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. For information I would ask the gentleman if each one of these Senators has not a secretary?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman for some years we have gone into no detailed inquiry as to the administration of the Senate and have given their recommendations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact the House has to appropriate for all these expenditures of the Senate? I understand that to be the fact. Then why should they not state what the duties these thirty clerks are to perform?

Mr. LITTAUER. They practically perform the same duty your clerk performs.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But there are more than thirty; there are ninety Senators.

Mr. LITTAUER. But those thirty are Senators who are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I understand, each chairman has his clerk.

Mr. BINGHAM. These are clerks of Senators not chairmen of committees and go to the other side of the House, the minority side. That is the history—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is that the meaning of it?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is to give the Senators on the other side—the minority, whatever the character of the Chamber may be—the same convenience of clerical aid that the chairmen of committees have who are in the majority, assigned to chairmanships of committees.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I believe we have two clerks in the House, have we not, of this kind belonging to the minority?

Mr. BINGHAM. We are on a different basis, because we each have a personal clerk.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I ask why we should have but two and the Senate have thirty to perform the same service?

Mr. BINGHAM. Every Member on both sides has his clerk. The House has thought for years that is all the convenience any Member needs.

Mr. LITTAUER. If the chairman of the committee will permit me; each Senator does not have a private clerk. There is no provision in the bill for a clerk to each Senator the same as to each Representative. The Senators are provided for either by chairmanships to their numerous committees, but those who are not chairmen of committees are here provided for with a clerk at \$1,500.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. MADDOX. Have they not got a messenger or two and another boy?

Mr. LITTAUER. It is beyond our control, as experience has proven.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We could inquire into it, however?

Mr. LITTAUER. Oh, decidedly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Clerk: For Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$5,000; hire of horses and wagons and cartage for use of the Clerk's office, \$900, or so much thereof as may be necessary; Chief Clerk, journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$3,600 each; tally clerk, \$3,000; printing and bill clerk, disbursing clerk, and enrolling clerk, at \$2,500 each; file clerk, assistant disbursing clerk, assistant enrolling clerk, resolution and petition clerk, newspaper clerk, index clerk, assistant journal clerk, and assistant to Chief Clerk, at \$2,000 each; librarian, distributing clerk, stationery clerk, and superintendent clerks document room, at \$1,800 each; one bookkeeper, two assistant librarians, and seven clerks, at \$1,600 each; document and bill clerk, \$1,600; document clerk, \$1,440; locksmith, who shall be skilled in his trade, \$1,200; one assistant in Clerk's office, and one assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,400 each; assistant index clerk, \$1,500; telegraph operator, assistant file clerk, and stenographer to the Clerk, at \$1,200 each; assistant telegraph operator authorized and named in resolution adopted January 15, 1902, \$1,200; one assistant in library, one assistant in document room, one assistant in stationery room, and one messenger in file room, at \$900 each; one page, \$720; attendant in charge of bathroom, \$1,000; three laborers in the bathroom (including William Richardson), at \$720 each; three laborers, and one page in enrolling room, at \$720 each; messenger in Chief Clerk's office, \$900; in all, \$94,600.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. On page 12, line 8, after "file clerk," insert the words "docket clerk." This officer is now carried by resolution, and for lack of proper explanation he was not given his place in the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee accepts the gentleman's amendment.



Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that this gentleman is provided for.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. He is provided for by the resolution of the House, and is now acting under that.

Mr. BARTLETT. But, Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rule, in order to include anyone under this bill it must be authorized by law. A resolution of the House is not a law, except to the House. When anybody is authorized to do work, and receives salary by a simple resolution of the House, he is paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and to put it upon an appropriation bill simply because authorized by a resolution of the House, in my opinion is not one authorized by law. I am not going to enter any objections to it if it is necessary; but I do not want it to be made a precedent that a matter which is in order on the bill, when authorized by law, is also in order when it is simply authorized by a resolution of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Had this been called to our attention it would have been in the body of the bill. We have operated under a resolution of the House, and when there was employment given by a resolution of the House it has always been recognized as coming under the rules of the House in the general application of the rules. This was simply an error, and the committee desire the correction of that error.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not making any point of order, if it is subject to a point of order; but I do not want it to be a precedent for a matter being put into an appropriation bill as authorized by law, such as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, when it is authorized by simple resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say that it has been uniformly held that a resolution regarding an officer of the House is existing law.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,000; messenger, \$1,200; janitor, \$1,000; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$3,000, and \$1,000 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,000; messenger and assistant clerk, \$1,200; janitor, \$1,000; clerks to Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Claims, District of Columbia, Elections Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Industrial Arts and Expositions, Insular Affairs, Invalid Pensions, Judiciary, Labor, Library, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Pensions, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Printing, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Rivers and Harbors, Revision of the Laws, Territories, War Claims, and clerk to continue Digest of Claims under resolution of March 7, 1888, at \$2,000 each; assistant clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, \$1,600; assistant clerk to the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads, \$1,400; assistant clerk to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, \$1,400; assistant clerk to the Committee on War Claims, \$1,200; for janitors for rooms of the Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Claims, District of Columbia, Elections Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Insular Affairs, Invalid Pensions, Judiciary, Library, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Pensions, Printing, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Rivers and Harbors, and War Claims, at \$720 each, and said janitors shall be appointed by the chairmen, respectively, of said committees, and shall perform under the direction of the Doorkeeper all of the duties heretofore required of messengers detailed to said committees by the Doorkeeper; in all, \$99,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the provision for clerks and messengers to committees, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if all these clerks and janitors to the various committees are now authorized by law?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that with one exception they are all authorized by law, either by resolution of the House or general statute; further, that that one exception consists of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which we specially call attention to in our report to the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will not make any point on that.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is the only exception in the whole list.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Can he tell me where the law is that authorizes a clerk to the Committee on the Library—whether that is by resolution or by act of Congress?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state that the current law authorizes that clerk.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman means by that that the appropriation for this clerk has heretofore been carried in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; carried in the law for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that. This committee is the Library Committee, which is composed of three members. Am I correct about that?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is composed of five members. It is a joint committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no; you provide for the joint committee. It is the Library Committee of the House, over which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] presides, and there are but three members.

Mr. OLMSTED. Five in all.

Mr. BINGHAM. The present Library Committee of the House consists of five members.

Mr. BARTLETT. This is an annual clerk, is it not? This is a provision for an annual clerk?

Mr. BINGHAM. I can say nothing beyond the fact that the committee accepted the present working force of the House in every respect, and saw no reason to make any change in that which the House, and this same House, has heretofore concurred in.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can the gentleman tell me where he gets the authority for a janitor for the Committee on the Library?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is in the existing law.

Mr. BARTLETT. What you mean is that it is carried in a former appropriation bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. In the current law.

Mr. BARTLETT. In a former appropriation bill—

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Or by resolution from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. BINGHAM. An appropriation bill, approved by this very present House at its earlier session. I will say to the gentleman that in regard to the House subordinate force, with one or two small increases of compensation, and perhaps I might say without any material changes, we have followed current law, and the committee in no wise has assumed the introduction of a larger force except in the one specific case that seemed to be imminent and necessary in connection with rivers and harbors.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no question that that is proper, and will make no point on that at all. I happen to have been for years upon the Committee on Accounts, and I notice that a number of committees which now have annual clerks did not have them prior to this Congress. We had provided for them by resolution brought from that committee, giving to those gentlemen clerks during the session; and it seemed to me that the Committee on Appropriations have taken all those committees, where the Committee on Accounts have authorized the employment of clerks during the sessions of Congress, and have put them in here as annual clerks.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would say to the gentleman right there that your Committee on Appropriations, the House having once determined what shall be the subordinate force, would not take upon itself the responsibility of making changes in that subordinate force. We should not assume to do anything in contradiction of the action of the House. To do so would militate against our relations as a committee with the House, and it would be an assumption of authority that the House did not intend to give us, when the House had once voted to determine what should be its subordinate force.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman misapprehends my position.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BARTLETT. One minute, until I get through with my statement.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think I could answer the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will give you plenty of opportunity. Just let me finish this sentence, and I shall be glad to hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

My proposition is this, Mr. Chairman—that the Committee on Accounts have during the previous sessions of this Congress been called upon, as they have at other sessions of previous Congresses been called upon, at the definite request of various chairmen to furnish clerks to the several committees. The Library was not one of those, because they had succeeded in getting an annual clerk at \$2,000 in an appropriation bill which passed last year. Take, for instance, the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, of which I am a member, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and so on. The House has passed a resolution in which it said that these committees were entitled to clerks during the session. Now, the Committee on Appropriations has taken up a number of these committees which the House by passing the resolution gave clerks during the session of Congress and embraced them in this bill, making them annual clerks.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. The intention of the committee is in

every instance where the House previously appropriated for a session clerk to give them a session clerk, and when the House appropriated for an annual clerk we have given them an annual clerk. Can the gentleman from Georgia suggest a single instance where that has not been the case?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have suggested two. In the first place, the Committee on Accounts has no right by simple resolution to appropriate money for any such clerks.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I mean, when the Congress has provided for it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. We have intended to follow exactly the direction of Congress. If the gentleman can point out any instance—

Mr. BARTLETT. I am trying to get information from the committee.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. That is what we have done.

Mr. BARTLETT. Take the janitor for the Committee on the Library. I will ask the gentleman if that was passed by resolution or an act of Congress?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think that is in the current appropriation. I don't remember how it was originally passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to know, because it occurs to me that we are appropriating a great deal of money for that committee.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. All this committee does is to follow out existing law, and if the gentleman will look at the law of last year he will find that it is the same as the provision in this bill for the Library Committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. The janitor was carried in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. That is the fact.

Mr. BINGHAM. I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia that the appropriations in reference to the clerical force—that when a resolution comes to the House limiting it for the session, it is so followed, and when it comes to the House and the House determines that it shall be a permanent clerk, it is so followed. There is not a single committee in the paragraph of this bill that has not had their old-time current law established by a resolution of Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then I will move to strike out the word "Library" in reference to the janitor on page 15, line 10, where it says "janitor for the Library." It occurs to me in the first place that I will make the point of order that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will say to the gentleman that he is fully within his right if he wants to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late.

Mr. BARTLETT. Very well. Then I will move to strike out the word "Library" in line 10, page 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 10, strike out the word "Library."

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with that Committee on the Library having only five members, with an annual clerk at \$2,000 a year, paid when Congress is in session and not in session, it is a little extravagant to add to that the cost of a janitor at \$720 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTLETT) there were—ayes 30, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the reading of the bill I would like to ask the chairman of the committee some questions. Now, there is brought in a resolution by which somebody is put on the pay roll. Is that to be construed hereafter as existing law—that resolution? Is that the way it is construed?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would state to the gentleman that it will depend upon the terms of the resolution. If the resolution comes into the House for the session, and the session closes, then it is at an end. If it comes in as a permanent clerk, why, that is different, because this House can enact legislation for a permanent clerk in the future just as well as it can enact legislation for anything else in the future; and it being so enacted that a clerk shall be given to a Committee on the Post-Office or that an additional clerk shall be given to the Committee on Appropriations, it will be so construed.

Mr. CLARK. But this House can not create the office of a permanent clerk by simple resolution, can it?

Mr. BINGHAM. I should say yes.

Mr. CLARK. That is, as much an officer as is the United States marshal?

Mr. BINGHAM. Under the ruling I should say yes.

Mr. CLARK. Now, I desire to ask another question. Something happens to be put into one appropriation bill, we will say. Is that to be construed for all time to come as existing law? What is the reason an appropriation bill does not die when the year ends?

Mr. BINGHAM. If it comes in in the bill as this janitor came in, to be added to the regular force, it will come in in the future from the Committee on Appropriations, and the House under the ruling, which is just accepted by the gentleman and made by the Chair, has the power to continue that clerk; but under the rules of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] or any other gentleman can move to strike it out, and then that particular House can determine the proposition.

Mr. CLARK. But you occupy an entirely different position when you are moving to strike out and when you are standing on a point of order to existing law. What I want to know once and for all is, if you happen to get an item into an appropriation bill once is that to be construed then as existing law?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is construed as existing law.

Mr. CLARK. Then I shall pay more attention to what they get into appropriation bills in the future. Why, an appropriation bill dies when the year runs out.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the matter, it is in effect this, that if at the time we are passing this appropriation bill there is in effect an existing resolution or law which at this time in this year fixes this appropriation for this office, then it is existing law; but if, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] says, that appropriation year had expired and there was not at the time we are passing this appropriation bill a resolution in operation and in existence at this time, then it could not be said that there was existing law for this appropriation.

Mr. CLARK. I know; but the trouble about the whole business is this: You do not get any chance to examine these bills unless you are a member of the Appropriations Committee. They are dumped in here all of a sudden, and then if we raise any question about it some member of the Appropriations Committee bobs up serenely and says, "Why, that is existing law," and that is the end of it. What I want to find out is, if a thing gets into one of these appropriation bills temporarily by somebody not paying attention, whether it is going to be construed for all time to come as the creation of an office under existing law?

Mr. OLMSTED. No; not for all time, but during the year for which it was enacted.

Mr. CLARK. But I thought we were appropriating for a new year.

Mr. OLMSTED. But we are making it in this year the existing law.

Mr. CLARK. And every time you object to an item somebody gets up over there and says that is existing law.

Mr. OLMSTED. Well, it is now.

Mr. BINGHAM. Any gentleman can make the motion to strike it out. It is existing law, and the remedy is in the hands of the House, and this House has just voted down a motion to strike out a laborer for the Library Committee because it is existing law.

Mr. CLARK. You can strike it out if you can get votes enough.

Mr. BINGHAM. And the committee acts upon it. The proposition is perfectly clear.

Mr. CLARK. What I was driving at is this: I was trying to put the committee in the weak position instead of putting every Member of the House in a weak position. It changes the burden entirely. If it is a matter of existing law, then we have to go to work and vote it out. It gives us the coin of vantage in one case and gives you the coin of vantage in another. Now, it seems to me it is in the nature of an outrage for one of these committees to come in here and ask for a clerk or an extra clerk or a janitor or anything for the session and get that through, and then for the Committee on Appropriations to come in here the next time and appropriate for that fellow, and then say it is existing law.

Mr. BINGHAM. They must say it is existing law.

Mr. CLARK. Now, everybody knows they have not secured economy. The President said so, and the chairman of the committee recognizes it as well as I do. If we are going to undertake to economize in appropriations, the best place to commence is with ourselves. We can not go on and appropriate everything we want for ourselves and then with a straight face say that some other fellow's appropriation ought to be cut down or out, and these supernumerary officials here ought to be gotten rid of.



Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to say to the gentleman from Missouri that he has the opportunity in his own hands to have the judgment of the House and have the House pass upon whatever may be his proposition.

Mr. CLARK. All right. I will get the judgment of the House on some of these things.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an assistant clerk to each of the committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Invalid Pensions at \$6 per day each during the session, \$3,762.

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, but, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in addition to what the gentleman from Missouri said about inserting these new laws into this bill, what I have said over and over again, nothing new on this subject. You bring this bill in here, reported yesterday, printed this morning. Now, I defy any man who is not a member of this committee to take this report and this bill and find out where the new law is in the bill if he wants to make a point of order. He simply can not do it; it is out of the range of possibility to do it.

Mr. BINGHAM. The amendments to the bill are printed in italics in the next to the last page and the last page of the report.

Mr. LITTAUER. Every single change in the existing law—

Mr. MADDUX. I understand that; but I undertake to say that without sending out and getting the original bill and last year's report and scrutinizing these appropriations in advance it is impossible for anyone to say that the law which goes into the appropriation bill is already existing law. And even when you examine into it and undertake to ascertain a new law, I defy any Member not a member of the committee, under the circumstances he has been placed in to-day, to find out what new law is here and make the point of order against it. We can not do it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me say this: There could not be on the part of the Committee on Appropriations any such action as the gentleman intimates, perhaps I might say. There is no purpose on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to come before this House with any disguised proposition.

Mr. MADDUX. I have not said so.

Mr. BINGHAM. We have tried to print in italics here every change we have given, and further on in the report in every bureau of this Government the increase in amount and the sum in dollars and the increase of clerical force. We have given the greatest detail.

Mr. MADDUX. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want all my time taken up.

Mr. BINGHAM. I want to show the gentleman that such a suggestion is not fair to the committee, and the committee would not present to this House any proposition that was hidden by either verbiage or hidden by a failure to report.

Mr. MADDUX. I did not intend to make any such suggestion as the gentleman seems to think I did. I did want to say, however, and I do want to insist now, that the rule ought to be different. My colleague here to-day has stood here and lectured this House, and very properly, I think. Here is a bill carrying \$29,000,000 or more of the money of the people of the United States, and probably not fifty men in the House at the time knew anything about what is in the bill; and one of the reasons this condition of affairs exists is that you bring this bill in, as I say, one day, and it is printed the next day and thrust right before the House, and it is a matter of impossibility for the Members of this House to look into it or see what is in it. They can not do it, and the result is we have all this confusion, and the whole legislation of appropriations is confined to the Committee on Appropriations. It is wrong. I say that for myself I feel I am as much responsible for the legislation of the Congress as the Committee on Appropriations. Why should I not have an opportunity to examine this expenditure of money? We did have a rule once, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa—probably I may be mistaken; it may have applied to something else. But these bills ought not to be taken up under three days after being submitted here, so as to give the Members of the House who propose to do so an opportunity to look into these appropriations and see what they are. While the committee may, and I have no doubt they do what they believe to be to the best interests of the country, a majority of this House may not agree with them. Men differ in opinion, but we are all sent here, as I say, with the same responsibilities, and I would be very glad now if the Committee on Rules would make such a rule as would give those of us at least who would like to examine and know what is in these appropriations an opportunity to examine them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations follow the law. That we have got to do, and the committee is not responsible for it, but this House and the Senate.

The gentleman from Missouri seems to be startled, and the gentleman from Georgia a moment ago, who moved to strike out, seemed to be startled as to how these clerks and janitors got in here. You put them in here yourselves when there is confusion worse confounded at the close of the session or any other time when some man jumps up and moves that the Committee on the Library have a janitor at \$720 and passes it. Then when it comes before the Committee on Appropriations what have we to do but to follow your commands? There is another thing they have to follow that is discretionary and within our power, and that is the estimates sent in from the Departments. It is the law that they must make known to the Committee on Appropriations through this House what they want for the next fiscal year. They make it in detail, and I want to say to my colleague from Georgia those estimates are at his service at any time that he wants to see them.

In this report we state what the estimates were in excess of this bill exactly to the dollar. We show that we have not given the estimates by more than a million of dollars. Now, what is your committee to do? We have, in the first place, to follow current law and appropriate the money you have ordered appropriated. More than that, when the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Treasury says to us in his estimate he must have ten additional clerks of class 2, 3, 4, or 1, and he comes before the committee and makes known to the committee why he has to have these, we put them in.

The gentleman speaks as if this would come within the discretion of the committee, but we have no discretion when it comes to appropriations under the rules of the House. We can not question your action. If you want us to do it, authorize us to do it and we will do it very quick.

Mr. MADDUX. Will my colleague permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDUX. You do assume to originate legislation?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes; but it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDUX. Then you violate the rules yourselves.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No.

Mr. MADDUX. Why, of course you do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, if my colleague will permit me, I wish to say to this House that if there is any legislation, in our opinion, that ought to be enacted we italicize it and put it before the House; and then it is for you to violate your own rule or not.

Mr. MADDUX. But you put it in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Of course the committee gives as its opinion what ought to be done, but it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. MADDUX. I understand all that. My question is to find out what in this bill is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, if my colleague on the other side will permit me a moment, I wish to state that the gentleman makes one mistake when he thinks time is an essence in understanding this bill. You may print it and give one solid week, and not twenty-five Members on either side of the House will read either the bill or report, but will come in here when it is considered as ignorant as a man from Porto Rico. [Laughter.] You won't know anything about it. I don't care how long it lies on the table. The only way to discover what is in the bill is to take it up under the five-minute rule; and there is no necessity for any hurry except that this is the short session. The committee is not responsible for that. I admit that three months is simply a ridiculous proposition on the part of Congress to legislate for 80,000,000 people and to transact their business; but as there are only three months in which to do this work, the Committee on Appropriations must hurry up or you will leave here on the 4th of March with some important appropriation bills not passed.

Mr. LLOYD. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true, as a matter of fact, that in this very instance the Appropriation Committee itself never had an opportunity to read the bill?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why, five of us, who constitute the subcommittee, did study the bill, and the remainder of the committee knew no more of it than my colleague from Georgia. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDUX. That is the very reason. The gentleman knows that it is not likely that any except those five will know anything about it, and it ought to be stopped. I think that confession alone is enough to demand that this bill shall be printed and give this House an opportunity to investigate it. The idea of five men making up a bill of \$29,000,000 of the people's money that is to be spent!

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is a confession that the House ought to profit by. It ought to put this House and the country on notice that this hurried legislation on appropriations ought

to be stopped. That is what we have been here doing for two weeks, on account of the hurry of the three months' session, with more than a billion of the people's money to be appropriated or disbursed in this country. You say, and the Speaker says to the Committee on Appropriations, "Gentlemen, you must hurry up." We met one week before you did, and we met every day, and part of the time at night, to get this bill ready for the opening of Congress. Gentlemen, give your Appropriation Committee time to make a bill and then we may be able to cut some of these things down.

Mr. BAKER of New York. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Speaker has said the Committee on Appropriations should hurry up? No resolution of this House has directed the Appropriation Committee to hurry up. We have not said so.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, that is another question, and it answers itself. The time allowed here between the 1st of December and the 4th of March is not fixed by the committee, and we have got to hurry. I say to you, Why don't you change the time of holding of the sessions of Congress? Why not meet in May and give this House decent time to consider the legislation of this country? When the 1st of December was fixed we did not have more than 20,000,000 people to legislate for; but here we are with 80,000,000, and you crowd into three months' work legislation for the appropriation and disbursement of billions of money. Why do you make objection to the action of the committee? Whose fault is it?

Mr. CLARK. I will tell you why we do not know anything about it. You do not have the time to find out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. Now, it is absolutely no answer to that state of affairs to say that there would not be 25 men in the House who would not understand these bills. Suppose there were only 5 who studied them. The 5 who did have a chance to study them and who did study them would find out enough about these bills to precipitate a discussion here that would lead, probably, to some results. Now, I believe that every Member of the House will take me to be stating the exact truth when I say that I am an industrious Member of this House. [Applause.] Just as soon as I got over here this morning I sent for this bill and this report. I sat down here and I undertook to find out what was in it. Well, there was such an uproar going around here all the time that you could hardly read—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let alone hear.

Mr. CLARK. And by the time that they commenced reading the bill by sections I did not know very much more about it than I did when I began; and the way that the bill is printed—I am not finding fault with the Appropriations Committee especially—the way the bill is printed you have got to take the report and the bill and read them together in order to find out whether you have any new legislation at all. One of two things ought to be done to it, and it is not simply for this bill—it is a general proposition. There ought to be a rule made in this House that an appropriation bill should be printed three days before it is considered. [Applause.] Then if people have something else to do or are too lazy to examine them let them go, but there are people in this House who would examine these bills. That is one thing that ought to be done. In the second place the bill itself ought to be printed in such a way that you could tell instantly, in reading the bill, without consulting the report, whether a thing was new legislation or not, and give some men who wanted to make a motion to strike it out or who wanted to raise a point of order, a chance to do it.

Now, I have the greatest respect in the world for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I feel a great deal of kindness for him. He says we have a right to strike any one of these things out. That is all true, but you can hardly strike anything out of an appropriation bill that they recommend here. It puts the shoe on the other foot about this matter of existing law. If an appropriation bill is not existing law in the proper sense—and I say it is not—then the point of order lies; but if the appropriation bill for this year is to be construed as existing law when we come to consider this bill, then it swaps the burden of the position, and you have got to move to strike out, and without a tremendous knockdown and drag-out fight about every one of these items that you want to get out, why, people follow the committee. I have done it a thousand times here when I ought not to have done it. The whole thing ought to be changed, and I want to repeat the statement. The President says that there ought to be economy. The Secretary of the Treasury says there is going to be a deficiency of, I believe, \$25,000,000. Now, you have got to do one of two things. You have either got to increase the revenues, which you can not do very well, or you have got to cut down the expenses, which you can do. And if you are going to cut down the expenses, the

place to begin to cut them down is on the expenses of running the Congress itself. Then everybody will say we are honest. But if we take all of these extraordinary appropriations to ourselves, and then jump on the War Department and the Post-Office Department, and the rest of these Departments, and undertake to cut them down, the whole country will have the right to point the finger of scorn at Congress and say: "You are a nice set of fellows, aren't you? You will not cut down a thing that affects the House or Senate, but you are willing to cut down everybody else." It does not give us a fair chance. I have never posed as a leader of economy in this House, but I would like to go over these appropriation bills intelligently, and wherever there is a chance to save anything reasonably I would like to do it. I would not vote to strike out an item that injured the public service anywhere. I trust that I am just as patriotic as anybody else on this floor; but there is no sense in squandering money, and the gentlemen there on that side of the House understand it just as well as we do, but you never can get at it. It puts everybody at a disadvantage. It puts the readiest talker in the House at a disadvantage. I do not want to get up here and be repeating the same thing over and over again. Why, if a man of good sense—any ordinary Member of the House—had had this bill for two days and had a chance to study it he could have fixed up a speech here an hour long that would have set the whole country to studying about these items of extravagance.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize very heartily with the spirit of the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Missouri. I think it is very unfortunate that this House does not pay more attention to these appropriation bills. Why, look at the House now; not one-third of the Members here, and that is its ordinary condition when appropriation bills come up.

Now, if the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia that an appropriation bill should not be taken up for three days would tend to change that, I would be in favor of it; indeed, I would favor it any way in order to try the experiment and give the Members a chance to study the bill, although I confess I think the result would be that they would put off the consideration of the bill until the three days were up, and then would come in as unacquainted with its contents as ever, and only one-third of the House, as to-day, would be here. But I should be very willing to try it, and I hope in the future we will try it, as we generally do. But in this particular case we wanted to get this bill through before the holidays; there is a special hearing set for next Tuesday, the impeachment case, and so we wanted to begin as soon as we could. Five of us were here all last week, during the vacation, getting it ready.

Now, as to the economy of the bill. I was much pleased with the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana made this morning, in which he said—I forget his exact language, but it was to the effect that as long as the committee would follow the suggestion of the Departments and give them more employees, the Departments would go on asking for more clerks. The House, as a rule, does not seem to sympathize with the gentleman. I confess that on that committee I sometimes reproach myself that I am getting into a position of antagonism to the Departments; that I am coming to feel that the Departments ask for more than they need, and that we try somewhat blindly to cut them down. There is a feeling on the part of members of the committee to cut down the Departments, and a feeling on the part of the Departments to keep grasping for more and more. That is unfortunate. Both ought to work together with mutual confidence. But one trouble has always been in the past that in committee we have always felt that when the matter came before the House, instead of helping us to keep down the clerkships and appropriations, the tendency was to increase them.

I am very glad the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Indiana feel that we ought to try and pare down these appropriations. Now, I venture to say that if they will take up this appropriation bill and study it carefully they will see that it has been economically framed; that we have cut right down to a sharp line, as far as we could estimate what the Departments need.

Mr. CLARK. This bill reports or recommends appropriations for something like \$255,000 over last year.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think it does. I can not give the exact figures.

Mr. CLARK. Well, it is admitted everywhere that there is a deficit in the Treasury, and you have got to meet it by an increase of taxation, or by paring down these appropriation bills.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. How about a revision of the tariff?

Mr. CLARK. I do not want to make any tariff speech now. I want to ask you this about the conduct of these bills. Suppose



that this bill had been here for three days and that one man, an industrious man, who wanted to pick into these things, had made himself thoroughly familiar with it. Now, you say that there is a small attendance on these bills, but suppose a man of that kind had worked upon one of these bills and had become thoroughly informed as to what was in the bill, does the gentleman not believe that before this time of day nearly every Member would be here in his seat and we would have had a kind of interlocutory debate to-day that would have been of great advantage to the House and country as well?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think it would have been of advantage to the House, and we would be glad to have that happen.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the gentleman think it would have been of advantage to the country?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I would be exceedingly glad to have any Member to study carefully this bill and attack it or any other appropriation bill and try to cut it down. That is just what I would like to see. As I say, I do not believe personally, there is much cutting that can be made; but I recognize that what the gentleman says is true, that it is of great advantage to have these bills attacked and I believe and I shall advocate in the committee, that we do print them long enough in advance to give the House an opportunity to study them, though I very much fear that there will not be any one man, even one righteous man, who will take it up and study it.

Mr. CLARK. Then I will make the gentleman a fair and square proposition now. If he will print one of these appropriation bills three days in advance, I will agree to stir up this House so that the House will be full and you will all be here.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. And it will not be my fault if that does not come true, I will say to the gentleman, but I am unfortunately not in a position to regulate it.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Why not print the new law which you insert in these bills in italics, so that when we follow the bill along we can see what is new.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. They are printed in italics in the report. The page and the line are given.

Mr. MADDOX. I know, in the report, but I am talking about the bill.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It might be well enough. I see no harm in that, but here they are pointed right out to everybody in the report. There are not many of them and they are pointed out in the report, with the line and the page, so that if the gentleman is interested he can not possibly mistake it.

Mr. MADDOX. I have just now found that out, after we have been working around here all the morning trying to find out something about this bill.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Then the gentleman has not read the report.

Mr. MADDOX. I did get the report when I came here early this morning for that purpose.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] expect us to digest in thirty minutes that which has taken the attention of the committee for at least five or six days?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Now, I do not think it is reasonable to do it. As I say, I will be very glad to give the gentleman an opportunity, and I hope the gentleman will take advantage of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When will the next appropriation bill be brought into the House?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That I do not know. Now, I would like to say one word more as to what the gentleman from Georgia has said. It seems to me the committee have made everything just as plain as possible in this report, giving the page and the line in the bill where everything new occurred. Now, as to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] says as to existing law, I think he is unreasonable about that. He says that everything that the committee puts in one bill comes the next year to be existing law and therefore you can not make a point of order against it. Why, Mr. Chairman, I think the House will recognize that that is fair and right, because if it has been in one year it shows that the House has once passed upon it. In other words, the House has approved it. Now, after the House has once approved it, it ought not to be in the power after that of any one Member of the House to strike it out. It is only fair after a measure has once been approved by the House that in order to be put out it should be rejected by a vote of the House, and that is all the present condition allows. If the thing is new, one man can strike it out; but if it

has been once approved by the House under the present rules it has got to receive a vote of the House to be rejected, and I think it is fair and right that a measure which has once been approved by the House should not be struck out without a vote of the House.

Mr. CLARK. Now, can you not just as well leave out one of these clerks or janitors in the Appropriation Committee, in framing this bill, as well as you can put in a new one?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why, you can not put a new one in without a vote of the House, and any man can rise and make a point of order against it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the reason you can not strike one out, just as well as you can put one in?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Because those that are in already have gone in by a vote of the House. The House has approved it, and no one man ought to be able to strike out what the House itself has once put in.

Mr. CLARK. You come here with a bill that is new legislation in creating a new office. Why not try the project of new legislation by leaving one of these fellows out? Just give the people a chance.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. We leave a great many out in this very bill; we leave a great many out.

Mr. CLARK. The trouble about it is we can not find out about it.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; we tell you what we leave out. We have not left anything out that affects the Members of the House, because I think the House will all recognize that there are a good many offices of this House that ought to be left out. It is true, as the gentleman from Missouri says, that we ought to begin to reform and economize ourselves, yet if the Appropriations Committee should begin and strike out every janitor and every clerkship in this House which we thought could be dispensed with, you very well know how long the Appropriations Committee would have a majority of this House behind it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, one word. We have followed in this bill the well-defined rule of the House in all preceding appropriation bills. There has been no deviation. There may be much in what the gentleman from Georgia, as well as the gentleman from Missouri, has stated, that there should be a longer time intervening between the submission of a bill to the House and its consideration by paragraph and under the five-minute rule. That is for the Committee on Rules. We come in with a report that we have submitted accompanying this bill, as accessible to the Members of this House as the bill itself, which explains every change we have made in the bill in such verbiage that it must be clear to anyone as to the changes. It is presumed that when inquiries under the five-minute rule come to the committee they will be able to give a reasonably fair answer to whatever may be the inquiry. We submit in this bill five or six amendments. I am frank to say that every one of them is subject to the point of order if they do not in the debate appeal to the common sense and common judgment of the House as wise suggested legislation. We give you the sum total in dollars and we give you the sum total in increase in number of subordinate force. The only phase of this bill that it is impossible for the Members to know is the hearings that we have given to the representatives of all the Departments where we felt called upon to ask for explanation as to details of force.

First, as to this man receiving twelve hundred dollars, why he should receive fourteen hundred dollars. Why this man should be reduced and why this man should be promoted. Why a new man should come on in the force. And questions of like character. That is the result of our examination, which by the rules of the Committee on Appropriations is given to five members, because they may meet at their own convenience and attempt to pass judgment upon the question of appropriations, large or small; but when it comes to the practice involved here of a change of policy, such as in two or three items of this bill, italics are printed in this report, so every man will know every change that is proposed in this bill. I am very free to say that this House, with its vast number of Members, can only proceed intelligently upon that rule, and I submit that I have not had a single appeal from a subordinate of this Government in the conduct of this bill for the last ten days who has come to me asking for an increase of his compensation. We have given a hearing to those designated by the departments to tell us in detail why the subordinate force should be either decreased or increased in number or decreased or increased in emolument. You bring that question before this House and you never will reach a conclusion. It has taken five men a week, working from 10 o'clock until 5 each day, to reach a conclusion. All we can bring to you is the sum total. We can not go into details unless

you read our book in connection with our hearings. Now, as to whether this bill should come before the House some days for consideration, we are following the rule, and we have given as much consideration to the bill as a subcommittee has ever given to any preceding bill.

The general committee has given it some consideration. We bring the bill before the general committee. We make an explanation of every inquiry that is made in the committee that has caused the determination of the subcommittee. We have cut this bill more than any bill I have ever handled in this House for years. The Department asked for a million more than was appropriated last year. We have cut down about eight hundred thousand, and we leave simply an increase of a little over \$200,000, one of the important changes being for the Civil Service Commission, the other increases of the bill being made up of clerks—one or two—to the other Departments. The bill was considered fairly. Gentlemen say why do you make this man \$1,400 instead of \$1,200? We take the reasons given by the representatives of the Department, and our committee takes the reasons given by the representatives to the subcommittee of five. The committee simply give to the House a well-prepared, carefully digested bill, and that is the whole proposition.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 11 clerks to committees, at \$6 each per day during the session, \$13,784.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about these lines, beginning with line 24 on page 15—11 clerks. What committees are referred to in this provision for "11 clerks, at \$6 per day during the session?"

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that this is in accordance with the action of the Committee on Accounts, that brings in a resolution at the commencement of each Congress, setting forth just exactly what these lines set forth, and your committee have simply complied with the action of the House in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Accounts. That is all there is in this paragraph.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I see in the preceding paragraph that you have mentioned every important committee of this House and given each of them one clerk, and some of them assistant clerks.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Now, you bulk eleven clerks of committees without stating what committees. I will ask the gentleman this further question, if these committees referred to are the dead committees of the House, that never have a bill referred to them and never have anything to do?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman that the only additional clerk to committees of the House that this bill carries is the assisant clerk to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that is a case for the House to determine—

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What I wanted to ascertain was these eleven committees that these clerks are given to. It simply provides for the eleven clerks to committees, and I presume they are the committees of this House that never meet.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state that the House has already determined to what committees these clerks shall be assigned.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Where will I find those lines in this bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. They are given in the RECORD in the early part of the Congress and printed in detail.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The gentleman can find the list of these clerks by consulting the chairman of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. BINGHAM. The records of the Committee on Accounts will show it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will scarcely have time to see those before time to vote.

Mr. BINGHAM. The House has directed the Committee on Appropriations to make this provision.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will it be subject to the point of order?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not see how a point of order can run against it. You have done it yourselves. It is being done by this House in this Congress.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then this other question I desire to ask. Do these eleven clerks, in addition to the clerks heretofore provided for, cover every committee of the House? Does it give each committee a clerk?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not every one.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Which one is left out?

Mr. BINGHAM. I can not tell the gentleman until I could have an opportunity to inspect the record.

Mr. LITTAUER. Just let me state the House always takes action during the session, passing resolutions increasing this

number. Not only are these eleven clerks taken up according to the report of the Committee on Accounts, but we always pass one or two resolutions granting an additional one in each session. Last year we passed one for the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: For Doorkeeper, \$3,500; hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon and harness, \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; assistant doorkeeper, and Department messenger, at \$2,000 each; one special employee, John T. Chancey, \$1,500; one special employee, \$1,500; clerk to Doorkeeper, and janitor, at \$1,200 each; thirteen messengers, including the messenger to the reporters' gallery, at \$1,200 each; thirteen messengers, at \$1,000 each; messenger to the Speaker's table, \$1,000; fourteen messengers on the soldiers' roll, at \$1,200 each; twelve laborers, at \$720 each; two laborers in the water-closet, at \$720 each; ten laborers, at \$720 each; one laborer, \$600; ten laborers, known as cloakroom men, at \$50 per month each; female attendant in ladies' retiring room, \$720; superintendent of folding room, \$2,000; five clerks in folding room, one at \$1,800 and four at \$1,200 each; foreman, \$1,500; messenger, \$1,200; page, \$500; laborer, \$720; nine folders, at \$900 each; five folders, at \$840 each; eighteen folders, at \$720 each; two night watchmen, at \$720 each; two drivers, at \$600 each; two chief pages, at \$900 each; forty-three pages during the session, including two riding pages and two telephone pages, and ten pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$2.50 per day each, \$22,467.50; horse and buggy for Department messenger, \$250; superintendent of document room, \$2,000; assistant superintendent of document room, \$1,800; six assistants in document room, one at \$1,600, two at \$1,400 each, one at \$1,200, and five at \$1,000 each, and one janitor, at \$720; in all, \$164,957.50.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on page 18, in line 5, I move to strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine." I would state that it is simply a misprint, and does not change the sum total of the appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 5, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof "nine."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why he increases the number of laborers in the cloakrooms?

Mr. BINGHAM. We do not. I would state that this is no increase. It is simply current law.

Mr. LLOYD. I understand that under the existing law there were eight individuals in the cloakroom, and under this bill ten are provided for.

Mr. BINGHAM. We have made no increase.

Mr. LLOYD. You will find, as I understand it, on page 7 of the existing law, eight laborers known as cloakroom men at \$50 per month each. This bill provides for ten laborers known as cloakroom men at \$50 per month each. That is certainly an increase of two men.

Mr. LITTAUER. The other two were put in on the deficiency bill of last year.

Mr. LLOYD. Put in on the deficiency bill? Then it was not in the legislative bill?

Mr. LITTAUER. No; but it is current law at this time.

Mr. LLOYD. It is current law by combining the two laws—the legislative act and the deficiency bill—together.

Mr. LITTAUER. One is as much law as the other.

Mr. LLOYD. I know, but we wanted to know where to find it.

Mr. LITTAUER. That is right.

Mr. LLOYD. I did not know where to find it. All I could find was the existing law as stated in the legislative bill, and as stated in that existing law I find that there are eight instead of ten. Now the explanation explains. You have provided for it in the deficiency bill heretofore, and that made it ten. Now you provide for both in the legislative bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would state to the gentleman that we do not make existing law. We simply take it and carry it in our bill.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; I understand that explanation.

Mr. BINGHAM. But when we make an exception we put it in our report in detail, in order to show increases or decreases. But I want to say—

Mr. LLOYD. But in this particular case it does not show in that exhibit.

Mr. BINGHAM. As to the force of the House, except what is published on the first two or three pages of our report there has been no change.

Mr. LLOYD. Now, I wish to take another line. You provide for—

43 pages during the session, including 2 riding pages, 2 telephone pages, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$2.50 per day each, \$22,467.50.

In the existing law the amount provided was \$15,307.50. Why the difference between the two?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is very simply explained. The gentleman will understand that this is a short session of Congress. The next session of Congress that this bill will be applicable



to, commencing as this bill does on the 1st day of July and running for the next year, is a long session of Congress. These are per diem employees. That is what makes the difference in the compensation.

Mr. LLOYD. Well, that is a satisfactory explanation, but the bill itself does not explain it.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is in the report. We make declaration of that in the report.

Mr. LLOYD. I did not happen to observe that.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is simply the difference between the long and the short session.

Mr. LLOYD. But you see here is the old law and the new bill, and in my examination it makes it very difficult for one who is a novice to investigate. Just in that connection I should like to call attention to a paragraph that I find in existing law which makes the matter plain. On page 9 of the existing law I find this—

Mr. BINGHAM. On page 9 of the report?

Mr. LLOYD. Page 9 of the existing law.

That wherever the words "during the session" occur in the foregoing paragraph they shall be construed to mean 121 days from December 1, 1904, to March 31, 1905, inclusive.

That makes the matter plain.

Mr. BINGHAM. The difference between the short and the long sessions.

The Clerk read as follows:

To continue the employment of the clerk to the conference minority of the House of Representatives, \$2,000; and for messenger, \$1,200; in all, \$3,200.

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. I understood the gentleman to say that he made a note of all new law; that is, he italicized the new law in this report. I have examined it somewhat, and I want to ask him if he regards the addition of twenty-three new clerks that goes to the Civil Service Commission as new law. I find no reference to it in the report, and I do not know where to find it in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We are nearly to it now.

Mr. MADDUX. We were told that it was all italicized, and I do not find anything of that kind italicized.

Mr. BINGHAM. I gave full notice to the House, coupled with the remarks that I made this morning. I am willing when we come to the paragraph of the bill—

Mr. MADDUX. Where is that paragraph?

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman will find it on page 3 of the report.

Mr. MADDUX. But where is it in the bill?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will look at the index he will find that it is on page 33.

Mr. OLMSTED. The index shows that it is on page 33, and if the gentleman will turn to page 33 of the bill he will find it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Official reporters: For six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$5,000 each, who shall also, when so required, perform duties as stenographers to committees; assistant official reporter, \$1,200; in all, \$31,200.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, lines 17 and 18, strike out the following words: "who shall also, when so required, perform duties as stenographers to committees."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this provision was put in the bill last year on the floor, and was not reported by the committee. It requires that the official stenographers of the House shall, when required, report the proceedings of committees, putting no limitation on that requirement that they shall so report when their services are not required in the House. As a matter of fact, it has proven impracticable, I am informed, to use the House stenographers as stenographers to committees, because, while they are at leisure in the forenoon and can take notes, they have no time to extend them afterwards.

If the provision is allowed to stand in the existing law at all, it ought to be so limited as to provide that they may so serve when they are not engaged in their official duties in the House; but this requirement is in any event too broad and too sweeping, and it seems to me it ought to be stricken out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what has been said by my colleague on the committee, I want to say that when one of these stenographers serves before a committee from early in the morning until 12 o'clock, and then is called in on this floor, and every forty minutes comes back on to this floor during the balance of the day, during the whole afternoon, it is just physically impossible to do that kind of work. Your committee had to put it in here because it was current law. It

was put in last year on motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. It got into the bill in an unguarded moment. I know that these stenographers can not perform these duties before committees in the forenoon and then come into the House in the afternoon and properly discharge their duties here. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will prevail and that this provision will be stricken from the bill.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stenographers to committees: For four stenographers to committees, at \$5,000 each; assistant stenographer to committees, \$1,600; in all, \$21,600.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of this bill whether any inquiry was made as to the sufficiency of this provision? Here is a provision for four stenographers to committees at \$5,000 each. I am satisfied that four stenographers can not do the work of the committees. They do not do it. I am told that there is a constant expenditure made necessary by the demands of the committees.

Then, again, it seems to me that there is no propriety in making them annual stenographers. It would be a great deal better, in my judgment, to make an appropriation for the purpose of securing stenographers to be used while committees were in session. Here is the short session, and \$5,000 is paid for the three months' services. I think that is not economy; and another sum, how much I do not know, is being paid during that time for labor that it is utterly impossible for these gentlemen to do. I would be glad to know if the subject has been inquired into or if any thought was given it by the committee. I know that the present method of securing stenographers is inadequate. There is a great demand, a growing demand, on the part of committees for the use of valuable stenographers. I think they might be session employees; they might be employed by the month, and in that way the appropriation of \$21,400 might be sufficient for the uses of the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, I will explain. We have made no special inquiry on the subject, for there came to our committee no complaints from any committee as to an increase of the number of stenographers for committees.

However, this Congress by its action has added one to the general force of stenographers and assigned him to the work of the committees. That was supposed by the Congress to meet the demands and the requirements of the House. Now, as to the matter of the sum to which the gentleman refers, he doubtless means that which the stenographers of the House pay to the men who do their detail work down in the office.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no; I do not. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not refer to that at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thought the gentleman referred to that.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think I am correct in saying that it often happens that more than four stenographers are in the service of the various committees at the same time. Now, there is some method by which those in excess of four are paid. I am not familiar with the method. Perhaps some gentleman can explain the matter, and I for one would be glad if he would do so.

Mr. BINGHAM. I could briefly respond to the gentleman to this effect—that should that be necessary all that would be required would be to come in the House and make a motion, which would be referred to the Committee on Accounts, approved by the Committee on Accounts, brought back to the House, and approved by the House, and payment made out of the contingent fund of the House as miscellaneous expenses. That is a quick remedy.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Is it really being done?

Mr. BINGHAM. That I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I think it is not even necessary, under the rules of the House or the law, to come into the House at all. Any chairman of a committee who needs a stenographer when there is not one available of the committee stenographers has a right, under the law, to get an order from the Committee on Accounts and employ a stenographer from the outside, and the practice is to furnish a stenographer from the outside when the committee stenographers are already engaged.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then that is a better solution of it. That, I think, gives the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] the information he desires.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I add a word? One reason why the committee did not inquire about the stenographers to committees was because the current law, which we did not know was to be changed, provided that the House stenographers could be called in, which of course made the supply abundant. Now, it seems to me individually that the suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that we

should appropriate a lump sum of, say, \$20,000, inasmuch as we have now four stenographers who receive \$5,000 each, would be economy for the House, and have no permanent committee stenographers. Of course the stenographers in the House we need to have permanent, because we need to have the very best that can be provided in the country; but it does not seem to me that the committee stenographers need to be any better than, for instance, our ordinary court stenographers, and an abundant supply of them ought to be procured for \$20,000. I should think that if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] would frame such an amendment it would be in the line of economy.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should say that I think the solution suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is easier of accomplishment without any change of law. He has stated how the procedure should be met, as well as how the committee can readily get the necessary stenographic help, by simply applying to the Committee on Accounts, and then the money comes out of the contingent fund.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the observation that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] has just made is satisfactory so far as concerns additional employees that may be needed, but it does not meet the objections made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. We are still left with four stenographers, at \$5,000 a year, who are employed only during the session, and I have not heard any suggestion from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] to eliminate that extravagance. Would it not be better, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] has suggested, that an amendment be presented at this time calling for a lump sum appropriation amounting to \$20,000, to be employed for the purpose of engaging such extra stenographers as may be needed from time to time rather than to appropriate a fixed sum of \$5,000 each for four stenographers who are needed only a part of each year?

Mr. BINGHAM. I think the intent of the paragraph and of the law is that this compensation should run to these four people.

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly that is the wording of the present law, but why not change the present law?

Mr. BINGHAM. If, however, the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] is that the committees of the House are in necessity and need more stenographic help, then, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that want is simply submitted to the Committee on Accounts, which committee authorizes the employment of an outside stenographer and then audits the account.

The solution is right there, and it came out of the contingent fund; and the proposition of the gentleman is to make another contingent fund, and we have fought strenuously and consistently against additional contingent funds. We have reduced the contingent fund of the House on this bill from \$50,000 to \$45,000.

Mr. SCOTT. And we are still left with a specific appropriation of \$20,000 to be paid to four stenographers, whom we only use a part of the time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Which seems to fill the requirements of the committees of the House, unless they find it necessary to take the procedure indicated by the gentleman from Illinois. The inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa was simply as to information upon the subject.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Strike out in line 25 the word "five" and substitute "three;" so that it will read "for four stenographers to committees, at \$3,000 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 25 strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three;" so as to read "at \$3,000 each."

Mr. BINGHAM. If the committee will allow me, the stenographic force of this House is a well-employed force, and they have with them, in connection with their work, a long-time record of this compensation, and the House has seemed to think for years past that \$5,000 is not too great a compensation for the work they do, and I trust the House will allow this appropriation to continue just as it is applied in the bill. You have a good force of men, who are worth the money we pay them, and I think that, in view of the gentleman's proposition, that as a temporary expedient we had better follow the rule. As has been stated, there is no trouble at any time for a committee to secure a stenographic reporter and have him paid out of the contingent fund. In other words, the result of this proposition will be to give another contingent fund.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Is it not true, under existing law, we have to pay \$5,000 a year to each of these four employees for a service that will be rendered between the 5th day of December and the

4th day of March—\$5,000 from the 5th day of December of the current year to the 4th day of March, 1905?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; we pay the same during vacation; their compensation is annual.

Mr. LLOYD. Their compensation is annual and the service is rendered during the sessions of Congress?

Mr. BINGHAM. The compensation is annual, just like the other officers of the House.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Suppose a special committee has a hearing during vacation. Are the services of these gentlemen available?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly; their service is subject to the order of the House at all times. If any services are required of that body, the men must report for that service.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Without any additional compensation?

Mr. BINGHAM. Without a cent of additional compensation.

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me not an unreasonable distinction to make a difference of \$2,000 between the salaries of the high-class men who are engaged in the very difficult and arduous work of reporting the debates on this floor and the men who need not necessarily be of so high a class, because their work is of a vastly different character, who are called in occasionally to report the proceedings or hearings before committees, where they have all kinds of time to take and transcribe the remarks which are made. In view of the fact that these men only serve for three months in one year and in the other year rarely more than six months, an annual salary of \$3,000 is certainly generous enough, and I believe the amendment should prevail.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much struck with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa in the first instance that it would be better to have a lump sum for these stenographers, but when I remember that the stenographers to the committees occupy a most confidential position in connection with the House and are required to be men who can keep their mouths closed in regard to matters which often take place in committees in the taking of testimony, it seems to me that we ought to have stenographers who do not reveal the secrets of a committee hearing until it is made public at the proper time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman if he does not think that a salary of \$3,000 ought to be sufficient to keep a man's mouth shut as well as \$5,000?

Mr. MANN. Permit me to say to the gentleman, if he will pardon me, the salary of \$5,000 to the stenographers is not paid only to the stenographer himself. The gentleman understands very well that every stenographer has to transcribe his notes, and these stenographers pay for the people who transcribe their notes, and the committee stenographers, I may say during the session of Congress, have more notes to transcribe than the stenographers on the floor of the House.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a fact the gentleman mentioned as being within his own knowledge that these stenographers do pay for the transcription of their notes?

Mr. BINGHAM. I want to correct that. It amounts to about \$700 in a session to the subordinate stenographer who makes the transcript. That account is transferred to the Committee on Accounts and paid out of the contingent fund.

Mr. SCOTT. So the stenographer does not pay for the transcription?

Mr. MANN. I said the stenographer paid for the typewriting of the notes. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the House pays for the typewriting and all paraphernalia?

Mr. BINGHAM. It becomes a paragraph in the general deficiency bill.

Mr. MANN. It is quite certain it will not be in the power of the House to keep the services of first-class stenographers in the House on a salary of \$3,000 a year. There is not a first-class stenographer in my city—if gentlemen have any in their cities who are earning less they can send them to my city—who makes less than from eight to ten thousand dollars a year clear.

Mr. PERKINS. That is a pretty extraordinary statement. In New York the official stenographers have a salary of \$3,500 a year, and that is all, and they are quite as good stenographers as those now employed as committee stenographers of this House which are now under debate.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has come to my knowledge since on the floor that these stenographers do pay for the typewriting at their own expense out of the \$5,000. I think somebody who is on the floor of the House who has knowledge in the matter ought to make a statement in that regard.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, I will look up the deficiency bill. I understand the statement is now made that they do pay for the transcription of their notes.

Mr. LACEY. I can answer that. They do pay for it, but they are reimbursed afterwards. [Laughter.]



The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LLOYD. One question.

Mr. BINGHAM. I read from the deficiency bill:

To reimburse the official reporters of the proceedings and debates and the official stenographers to committees of the House of Representatives, including the assistant official stenographer to committees authorized by resolution of the House of December 17, 1903, for clerk hire and extra clerical services during the first and second sessions of the Fifty-eighth Congress to March 4, 1904, \$750 each, and to John J. Cameron \$240; in all, \$7,740.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will remember that says for "clerk hire," but it does not cover the cost of the transcription of the notes or the cost of supplying typewriters.

Mr. BINGHAM. "For clerk hire and extra clerical services."

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what it means.

Mr. LITTAUER. We asked one of them when before the committee and they told the committee that they had paid it out of their pocket in the first instance and were reimbursed.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, please. Are not the stenographers for committees assigned to the committees as their stenographers?

Mr. BINGHAM. No.

Mr. LLOYD. Are these stenographers for committees assigned?

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no general direction, no specific assignment of the stenographers to any committee. The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations require to have a stenographer, but they do not report their proceedings.

Mr. LLOYD. And these are one or two of these four?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No.

Mr. BINGHAM. I now see what the gentleman means—there is no stenographer as a stenographer to the committee. The law with reference to the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the Committee on Appropriations, requires that their second clerks shall be stenographers. That is one of the qualifications that was to justify the House in giving to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations this additional clerk. He must be a stenographer.

Mr. LLOYD. What compensation does he receive?

Mr. BINGHAM. Two thousand dollars.

Mr. LLOYD. Then the stenographer of the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on Ways and Means, which ought to be probably the best stenographers to committees of the House, only receive \$2,000?

Mr. BINGHAM. That qualification of doing work as a stenographer is in addition to the general work of the committee.

Mr. LLOYD. Then, if I understand you, in addition to the work of stenographers, they are required to perform the duty of clerk?

Mr. BINGHAM. He is required to be a stenographer, and at any time when not engaged on the work of the committee any member of the committee takes him and dictates to him, and he is given \$2,000 a year. He must be a stenographer, but he never reports the proceedings of the committee.

Mr. LLOYD. But he must have the ability.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is only a question of ability.

Mr. LITTAUER. I desire to make the statement that these stenographers to committees are required to be as able men as those that take down the debates on the floor of the House.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it true that these stenographers assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations are the same that are assigned to the other committees?

Mr. LITTAUER. Certainly not. Those stenographers to which the gentleman refers are ordinary stenographers, for correspondence, and are used in getting up the bills. They are stenographers, but they are not capable of taking the hearings or statements of Cabinet officers and others that come before the Committee on Appropriations. They are used as in the Committee on Appropriations, in getting up the papers and any other work in the committee.

Mr. LLOYD. That is the point I intended to reach, whether you use any other stenographer than your committee stenographer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BINGHAM demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 44.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. LITTAUER demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SCOTT and Mr. BINGHAM.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 71, noes 65.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to offer an amendment to correct the lump sum in line 2, page 21, making the total \$13,600, instead of \$21,600.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That wherever the words "during the session" occur in the foregoing paragraphs they shall be construed to mean the two hundred and nine days from December 4, 1905, to June 30, 1906, both inclusive.

Mr. LLOYD. I should like to inquire about this session. Suppose the session of Congress next year should adjourn the 15th day of April. As I understand it, all session employees of the House will receive pay up to the 30th day of June.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. LLOYD. They are session clerks, though. This is intended to provide that so far as the session employees are concerned, that session of Congress legally shall continue until the 30th day of June.

Mr. BINGHAM. This bill commences the 1st day of July next.

Mr. LLOYD. You do not understand me. So far as the session employees of the House are concerned, the session of Congress next year will not adjourn until the 30th of June.

Mr. BINGHAM. You refer to session employees.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. The compensation of the subordinate force—the session employees—will commence the first Monday in December next and run until the end of the session. The House usually, I believe, gives an extra month's compensation.

Mr. LLOYD. That is the point I was concerned to get at. According to this bill they will receive their pay up to the 30th day of June, it seems to me.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct. That will be a long session.

Mr. LLOYD. It seems to me session clerks ought to receive pay only up until the end of the session.

Mr. BINGHAM. They will receive pay until the 30th of June.

Mr. LLOYD. Whether Congress adjourns before that or not?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; and that is predicated on the general theory that Congress runs until the 30th day of June or July 1. And further than that, let me go a step further, so as to give the full information; and, as a rule, Congress gives them an extra month's pay.

Mr. LLOYD. What would be your objection to this kind of a statement?

That wherever the words "during the session" occur in the foregoing paragraphs they shall be construed to mean the number of days from December 4, 1905, to the end of the regular session of Congress, both inclusive.

Mr. BINGHAM. The only criticism to that would be that it would be an indefinite appropriation, and we are trying to regulate this on a fair basis.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it necessary under the law that the appropriation be definite?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was going to say, as I stated in my first remarks, and I am informed here that only twice in twenty years has Congress adjourned before the 1st of June.

Mr. LLOYD. But if Congress does adjourn before the 1st of June—

Mr. BINGHAM. It is simply because we make a specific appropriation under the experience of the House, until the 1st of June, and at the end of this session the gentleman will be presented with a proposition to give these men an extra month's pay.

Mr. LLOYD. Suppose that the Congress does not adjourn until the 15th day of August. Has it been the custom of the House to give additional pay?

Mr. BINGHAM. Then we would have to bring in an additional and supplemental appropriation for the time they were employed here.

Mr. LLOYD. Why should we pay for the additional month and a half if Congress runs beyond July, when we pay them for a month and a half that they will probably not serve prior to the 1st of July?

Mr. BINGHAM. That may be true.

Mr. LLOYD. It seems to me that if one proposition is correct the other is correct, that we ought to stand by the law; but so far as this fiction is concerned, which is referred to in this paragraph, the session of Congress will end on the 30th day of June, whether it actually ends at that time or not.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman from Missouri is mistaken.

Take the case of the short session, although Congress adjourns on the 4th of March, the House force will receive compensation until the end of the fiscal year, June 30.

Mr. LLOYD. And this particular year—

Mr. BINGHAM. I am giving that as an illustration. This is the current year.

Mr. LLOYD. The law provides that that session shall end on the 31st day of March, if you will read it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the gentleman got the old bill?

Mr. LLOYD. I have the present bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. You are confusing, I am afraid, the propositions contained in this bill, which are for the next fiscal year. This bill does not begin to run until the 1st day of July.

Mr. LLOYD. Let me make my explanation. The existing law is that wherever the words "during the session" occur in the foregoing paragraph they shall be construed to mean one hundred and twenty-one days, from December 1, 1904, to March 31, 1905, inclusive. That is this session of Congress. Now, the law which you seek to enact—

Mr. BINGHAM. This law which we are now considering is for the next fiscal year. It does not take up the proposition of the short session; the current law takes up the proposition of the short session.

Mr. LLOYD. That is correct. This law simply provides pay for the session of Congress.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman surely can not deny that it is well to have definite appropriations, specific appropriations. Now, with the experience of twenty years there have only been two long sessions of Congress that have not extended up to June 30. This force that comes in here for the session get the benefit of a few extra weeks' pay, but that benefit to them would much more than be wiped out by the harm to us if we made an indefinite appropriation.

Mr. LLOYD. I do not object to this feature of it if that is made the end of the session, but it seems to me that the employee has just as much a right to work beyond the 1st day of July, as we have to pay him if he does not work before the 1st day of July.

Mr. BINGHAM. If they work beyond the fiscal year, they get compensation.

Mr. LITTAUER. Is the gentleman from Missouri objecting to sessional employees?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

Mr. LITTAUER. Is the gentleman's objection that they shall not receive extra pay if they do the work?

Mr. LLOYD. No; but if we fix a day for the end of the session, it ought to be the end of the session whether it goes beyond it or not.

Mr. LITTAUER. Well, we do fix the end of the session in this case, but if it extends beyond that there is a deficiency appropriation taking care of these men for the extra work that they perform.

Mr. LLOYD. I have only been concerned in getting at the facts, whether it is true that when the session extends beyond the 30th of June you make it up in a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. LITTAUER. That has always been the case.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

General administration: For Librarian of Congress, \$6,000; chief assistant librarian, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Librarian's secretary, \$1,800; clerk (assistant to chief clerk), \$1,000; two stenographers and typewriters, at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; in all, \$18,140.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I, in common with every other citizen, take great pride in the Library of Congress. I have no disposition to run a tilt against this institution, but I am constrained to believe that it is an exceedingly expensive luxury that perhaps the House has never considered in relation to the apparent benefit to the public at large.

The appropriations covered by this bill aggregate \$590,045. The employees connected with the institution constitute an army of 429, which I might say, in passing, is about twenty-five times larger than the standing army of Panama. [Laughter.]

If we were to take into consideration the cost of the plant—the building—\$8,000,000, the interest at 2 per cent—and I think that it is wise to so consider it, because, but for this appropriation, it is probable that the public debt would have been \$8,000,000 less—there is an interest charge of \$160,000, making the total cost of this pride-exciting institution \$750,045.

I do not know that it is possible for anyone to measure in dollars and cents the benefits of this institution, but I find that last year the readers in the main reading room numbered a total of 163,142 persons. The books issued in the main reading room numbered 336,123. If each reader should be considered as a borrower of a book, then the total number of books issued in the main reading room would be 499,305.

The bill now under consideration appropriates, as I have said, \$590,045. If the aggregate of appropriations should be divided by the total number of borrowers, as I have aggregated them, considering each reader as a borrower of a book, then the issue of that book has cost the United States \$1.19, which possibly might equal the cost of the book.

I would like to ask the committee if in making this appropriation they have considered the comparative value secured by the appropriation and the expediency of buying and presenting the books to the various persons to whom they have been issued? Would it not be cheaper for the Government to buy the books and make presents of them than to keep up this extraordinarily expensive but very ornamental institution? I call attention to this matter in connection with this further fact that every Department in this city has its library, scientific so far as it applies or is useful to the Department, but also having a miscellaneous department in which I think all classes of literature may be found. In addition to that, there is another very expensive library, a gift of Mr. Carnegie, that costs annually somewhere about \$30,000 to administer. Now, I do not want to be considered as hostile to culture, to the diffusion of intelligence, or anything of that kind, but I have thought that the procurement of books by any man who wanted books in this day and age was perhaps very easy of accomplishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the statement of my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], if left unchallenged, would create a wrong impression, although I have no doubt that he fully intended to have it create a right impression. The aggregate annual expense of the Library as an institution is, as has been stated, about \$590,000. It is proper, however, that the way in which this money is expended be pointed out.

In the first place, \$70,500 of this sum is paid to the employees of the Copyright Division. But, this Copyright Division is self-sustaining. The fees for copyrights are all paid into the Treasury of the United States, so that this \$70,000 can not properly be charged against the Library as a library.

In the second place, there is an expenditure of \$5,000 for the distribution of cards. As Members know, the national library—that is, the Library of Congress—is in communication, in a spirit of helpfulness, with all of the leading libraries of the country; with even small libraries that desire its assistance. There is a model library, a list of the books of which has been published, and the card indexes for that model library, and, indeed, for very much beyond that, are available to the other libraries that desire to work in connection with the national library. These card indexes are paid for by the libraries getting them, so that the sum of \$5,000 which appears here as part of this expense is repaid, and the item is therefore not a source of expense.

Mr. BINGHAM. And the only change in the law submitted from the current law.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. As the chairman says, this is the only change in the bill submitted from current law.

Then again, there is \$100,000 of this sum to be charged to the enlargement of the Library. It is ninety-nine thousand and odd dollars, but in round numbers we will call it \$100,000. These additions of books and so on become part of the permanent plant and should not be charged against current expense.

Again, there is an expense of \$40,000 for shelving and apparatus connected with the handling of the books, a permanent investment as part of the building itself.

These sums aggregate \$220,500, leaving about \$370,000 that might in one sense be charged as the cost of the Library.

Of that sum, however, \$107,000 is used for the care of the building itself. It is a very costly building, a very handsome one—one of the notable buildings of the world. It is kept admirably, as it should be. In order to maintain the building and the grounds in proper condition an expenditure of \$107,000 a year is necessary.

So we have left about \$260,000 as the expenditure for the maintenance of the Library. It is proper in this connection to say that while the Library was here in the Capitol building the books could not, from lack of space, be properly placed. They were piled upon floors and in corners and were not available for use. Except in small part, they were not catalogued. Since the establishment of this new Library the Library authorities have been trying to catch up with the classification and cataloguing of these accumulations of books, manuscripts, documents, etc., in the possession of the Library. This will account for \$88,000 more a year of these expenses. So that when we have made all proper allowances the actual expense for the maintenance of the Library itself is less than \$200,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that this explanation has been made, and yet it is an explanation that does not explain away this great aggregate of \$590,000.



I suppose that it is utterly impossible to speak of the cost of a library without speaking of the cost of these items, save the one that I first mentioned. They are all essential, and they are all of them, in one form or another, annual. While there is an item for shelving this year of \$40,000, there will be a corresponding item under some other name that means an appropriation next year, and while we have these books on hand, yet if it is going to cost so much to administer their use it is well to stop and consider whether they are, as gentlemen suppose they are, a valuable asset to the United States. There is this great aggregate.

Now, I would not suspend in any way any part of the usefulness of a library, but it does appear to me that there ought to be some way of retrenchment in the cost. Five hundred and ninety thousand dollars is an immense sum for the maintenance of this library. There is nothing corresponding to it that I have any knowledge of anywhere else in the country. I made the remarks that I did simply for the purpose of calling attention to this subject in the hope that there might be some method devised by which all the benefits that are secured may be secured at a reasonable expenditure of public money.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, my friend, I am sure, would not do away with the building, which is in itself a liberal education. People from all over this world visit it. They go away with memories of it that are pleasant to the United States, and I am sure he would not wish that building back into nothingness. The building being there, it must be maintained.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, I would not do anything that would disturb in any way his aesthetic taste.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Of course my friend from Iowa was only joking when he made that mathematical and financial calculation that it would be better to give a book to each person. Of course he knows that when he goes there not one book, but a dozen books, perhaps a hundred, will be drawn by him for consultation. That is so with every Member here. Men come from across the seas to see that Library and to consult that collection of books. The suggestion of the average being one book drawn per person can not be taken seriously.

If my friend means that some way should be found for reducing the cost of maintaining the Library without interfering with its efficiency, and will point out such a way specifically, I am very sure that the Committee on Appropriations would welcome the suggestion.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, as one of the committee having charge of this bill I am gratified to hear his criticism, of course with some qualifications. This is the first bill that has been brought into the House in connection with the Library administration that has held it down (with the exception of \$1,000 which we have increased in the card-index division, which brings in revenue to the Library) in my experience since the Library has gone into that building, and your committee recognized in making the recommendations for the next year that only current law should run. Perhaps in the near future it might be possible to take up, in the line of the gentleman's suggestion, some proposition of that kind, but your committee for the next fiscal year in this bill has held the Library down to current legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Catalogue and shelf: For chief of division, \$3,000; 5 assistants, at \$1,800 each; 7 assistants, at \$1,500 each; 6 assistants, at \$1,400 each; 12 assistants, at \$1,200 each; 6 assistants, at \$1,000 each; 14 assistants, at \$900 each; 4 assistants, at \$800 each; 13 assistants, at \$720 each; 3 assistants, at \$600 each; 10 assistants, at \$540 each; 4 assistants, at \$480 each; 6 messengers, at \$360 each; in all, \$87,740.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask permission to go back to the preceding paragraph in order to ask for information, commencing at the top of the page.

Mr. BINGHAM. What page?

Mr. HEPBURN. Page 24. What are the functions of these various officers? Two thousand dollars for chief of division. Are they engaged in making purchases for the institution?

Mr. BINGHAM. For purchasing new books. It is for the current addition to the Library of books perhaps that might not come to them under the copyright law. They attend all sales of old and valuable and very difficult to secure publications, and they go into the market and purchase these in competition at auctions at whatever may be necessary for them to secure them.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does it take these thirteen purchasing agents to expend this \$99,000?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is what they have heretofore been allowed.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Library if these thirteen persons are necessary to expend \$99,000?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That is what the law says. Mr. HEPBURN. I would like the opinion of the gentleman. Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is not a question of opinion. It is right before the gentleman's face. The gentleman asked for the fact, and that is the fact.

Mr. HEPBURN. But the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on the Library, ought to know, undoubtedly does know, the functions of these officers.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They are as stated by the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are named assistants. It is one of the divisions of the Library. These men not only purchase, but they are the men who make a very complete examination in wants as well as needed publications upon any given subject, to find out if new books are needed, rare volumes, and to complete serials or information upon certain lines wherein the Library is deficient. And they take up the matter of arrangement of the books. The bureau or division is given the allowance not only for the purchase of books, but they have to make an investigation preliminary to the purchase of the books and also to the alignment or location of the volumes.

Mr. HEPBURN. No; that is a function that is provided for in the next paragraph, I take it, in the matter of shelves—of "catalogue and shelf."

Mr. BINGHAM. The catalogue is a different proposition.

Mr. HEPBURN. "Shelf" signifies location. Do these gentlemen catalogue the whole Library?

Mr. BINGHAM. This is the location in the Library only of the books which they purchase.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does that catalogue require that great number of men?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not suppose they have approached anything near completing the catalogue of this Library.

Mr. HEPBURN. They have not got up with current business?

Mr. BINGHAM. The cataloguing is perhaps one of the most difficult lines of work before them.

Mr. HEPBURN. I simply wanted to know, you know.

Mr. LITTAUER. I would simply like to say in justification of this item that the purchasing department this year has purchased 30,575 volumes.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For three commissioners, at \$3,500 each; chief examiner, \$3,000; secretary, \$3,000; assistant chief examiner, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; eight clerks of class 4; thirteen clerks of class 3; sixteen clerks of class 2; thirty-two clerks of class 1; twenty clerks, at \$1,000 each; ten clerks, at \$900 each; eight clerks, at \$840 each; one messenger; engineer, \$840; two firemen; two watchmen; one elevator conductor, \$720; three laborers; and three messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$164,810.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that paragraph, or one of the paragraphs following it, for I understand that in this paragraph, and I have been cited to this page, twenty-three new officials are provided for for the Civil Service Commission. Now, I should like to see the chairman of the committee stand up, without consultation with the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, and tell us which are these twenty-three, and where they are provided for in this bill. It is said that it is so plain that any of us can find it by reference to it.

Mr. OLMSTED. If the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will permit me, I understand the gentleman from Georgia only wants information, and I wanted it the same as he does. I find thirty-three in the next paragraph, and twenty-three in the succeeding one, and I am going to move to strike them both out. I had no difficulty in finding them.

Mr. MADDOX. I simply wanted to illustrate by this paragraph about these appropriation bills. The gentleman tells us that these items of new legislation are perfectly plain; that they are all italicized. He says just look at the report; that anybody can see where the items are. Now, in the report it is stated that the salaries of these twenty-three employees aggregate \$26,240. It does not tell what each one of these clerks gets.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman, if he will look on page 33 of the bill—

Mr. MADDOX. I have that before me.

Mr. BINGHAM. As stated on page 3 of the report, the salary of the secretary is increased from \$2,250 to \$3,000. That has been given because he has been regarded as the best-informed man in the entire commission with reference to all extensions of the commission's work that have occurred since its inauguration by statute in 1883, the commission frequently changing in personnel. Specific appropriation in this paragraph that has just been read is made for thirty-three employees, with salaries aggregating \$41,000, for the field force of the commission, the

same being in lieu of persons now detailed from other branches of the public service. Gentlemen, understand, the same being in lieu. They are located specifically in the paragraph just read. Their work is now being done by persons detailed from other branches of the public service, and twenty-three of those—

Mr. MADDOX. What I want you to do is to point out the item in the bill which refers to those twenty-three.

Mr. BINGHAM. Twenty-three employees, with salaries aggregating \$26,240, are provided for to constitute the rural-carrier examining board in place of persons now on detail from the Post-Office Department and the postal service.

Now, that takes up the details here in the central headquarters of the Civil Service Commission, as well as the details from the various departments of the Government located throughout the country who are detailed to the boards covering the rural free-delivery service—

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman evidently does not understand me.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, will you permit me to answer this question?

Mr. MADDOX. I want to know where these officials are mentioned in the bill, so I can make a point of order.

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will turn to the thirty-fourth page of this bill he will find a large caption there, "Field force," and reading down that force you will find that there are thirty-three clerks included under that caption, with salaries amounting to \$41,000. That is the entire new field force asked for.

Mr. MADDOX. It is in that section?

Mr. LITTAUER. It is in that section, a paragraph that never was in the bill before. The next paragraph is the rural carrier board, where the twenty-three clerks are included. Is it italicized in the report?

Mr. MADDOX. No.

Mr. LITTAUER. There is nothing italicized in the report except the changes of existing law.

Mr. BINGHAM. Where there is an amendment. Now, will the gentleman from Georgia allow me one statement more?

Mr. MADDOX. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then I shall allow him to proceed without any interruption whatever. This proposition for an increase of the permanent force of the Civil Service Commission, or what on the surface appears to be such, is upon the recommendation of the commission for the reason, first, that when they make application under the general statute to the head of a Department for a detail, which they have the right to do, a second-class or inefficient clerk is sent to do the work for the commission. While the commission can call upon the head of a Department for a detail, they can not indicate the individual, other than in a general conversational way as to the character of the work that they want him to do; but they make application for a detail under the general statute. Now, the proposition comes from the Civil Service Commission, "Let us stand, as we put it in the examination, on our own legs." Let us exhibit what this civil service is costing. That was the desire of the committee. Let it be seen what it takes to run your commission. Under the present arrangement we never can tell, because you might have a hundred details or fifty details. Let us see what your commission is going to cost.

We are willing to make that exhibit, the chairman of the commission says, if you will let us have appropriated in your bill the detail of clerks we desire for good administration. We have got to meet the question of rural free delivery examinations throughout the country—

Mr. MADDOX. Is this being taken out of my time?

Mr. BINGHAM (continuing). And therefore your committee adopted the recommendations of the commission without seemingly any increase of expenditure, and let them get the body of clerks who can do their work sufficiently and with some conditions of ability without taking second-class clerks, in sense of ability, from the various Departments of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia be allowed to proceed for five minutes, or as long as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman from Georgia will be extended.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDOX. After exhausting my time, my question has never been answered, or anywhere in the neighborhood of it. The gentleman on the committee from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] pointed out the provision in the bill, in which the twenty-three clerks that I am looking after and the thirty-three that my friend from Pennsylvania wants to find are provided

for. He has told us where we may look for them. But what I am trying to get at is to show that we are not treated fairly, not intentionally, but it is impossible for any Member in this House to go after one of these appropriation bills and get any sort of light on the subject from the reports made, and that I think is demonstrated here in this proposition.

We are told that in the report where new law is proposed it is all italicized; that we could read the report and the italicized part would be amendments proposed, and that there would be no trouble to find it. Now, no man outside of the committee or the chairman, who has had four minutes of my time, and you all know that he never touched the subject at all—I say that no man can find that new law italicized in this report. One gentleman rose and told us what it was. I do not know whether the clerk of the committee whispered to him or not, but we all know that he knows where they all are.

Some one was inclined to sneer at me because I could not find it. I defy anybody to find it unless he knows exactly where it is. Now, as to these twenty-three clerks, the commissioner goes before the committee and states what he is after. His sole purpose is, according to his own statement, in answer to one of the members of the committee, to step in between the examining board here in Washington and the board that examines these carriers in the States. I say there is absolutely no necessity for these officers in my opinion. These carriers are examined to-day by special agents and the postmaster at the initial point, and the papers are sent here to the examining board, who pass upon them. Now, what is the provision in this bill? Here is a provision for twenty-three more clerks, and we are told that thirteen districts are to be established to put themselves between the board now authorized who examine carriers in the States and the board up here, and no statute which tells us what their duties are or what they are expected to do. We expect the agents will send the papers to these thirteen agents and of course those agents have got to forward them to the board here. The Civil Service Commission wants to get between this board here and the local board, and that is all there is to the question. After all the discussion we had this morning, in which I got no light on the subject, if anybody can assure me or demonstrate to me that there is any real necessity for these twenty-three additional men and the additional districts, if it is going to benefit the service, or going to benefit the country, I am willing to vote for it; otherwise I am opposed to it.

The gentleman has already said that it behooves us in this Congress to retrench, or have a deficit. If that statement is true, we should give heed to it. God knows I want to see the Government stand upon a firm financial basis—able to pay its debts without issuing any more bonds or requiring an additional tax. I do not want to see any more taxes put upon the people. In how many cases have you increased the number of officers? After you give a man a salary it is a mighty hard thing to take some of it off, but he can stand it if he is not accustomed to getting more. I tell you that right here is the place to begin the economy, and let us begin here.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the plea of the gentleman from Georgia, who has just spoken, for retrenchment. This happens to be one of the few items in this bill where retrenchment is brought about by the action or the recommendation of this committee. These twenty-three clerks are now at work by detail, doing the very work that we want to establish a permanent force for. They are now employed at salaries aggregating \$2,250 higher than are recommended here.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LITTAUER. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Are they taken from the eligible list under the civil-service rules?

Mr. LITTAUER. They are all transferred from the Postal Department here in Washington.

Mr. HILL. Is not that a violation of the civil-service rules to transfer clerks from one Department to another without authorization?

Mr. LITTAUER. In this case it is fundamental law that the Civil Service Commission may ask for detailed clerks.

Mr. HILL. They violate the rules themselves?

Mr. LITTAUER. They do, in order to keep the Department going.

The work of examining applicants for rural-carrier positions was formerly done for the commission by a large force of special agents of the Post-Office Department; but as the results were not entirely satisfactory, and complaints of unfairness in examinations were frequently received, it was decided, on December 3, 1903, to take the examining work out of the hands of the special agents and intrust it to the rural-carrier examining board, under the immediate direction of the commission. The force assigned to the board is much smaller in number than the force of special agents formerly employed to do the work. In lieu of the detailed employees with the board estimate is made for twenty-



three employees, with aggregate annual salaries of \$26,240. The estimate is \$2,250 less than the amount of salaries now paid those employees. The efficiency of this force has been seriously impaired, because in many cases competent clerks have not been detailed, while transfers from the force to other branches of the service have been frequent.

Now, I think that is a fair and complete answer. First, it is a retrenchment; it is a saving of money. Second, it permits the examination of these rural carriers to go on with a greater degree of fairness and uniformity than formerly.

Mr. LLOYD. What will become of the men already employed?

Mr. LITTAUER. They will go back to the work wherefrom they were detailed.

Mr. LLOYD. Then the Government, in the end, will have to pay for these additional people.

Mr. LITTAUER. No; no. If the gentleman will look at another paragraph right in our very plain report, where everything is taken up, he will find on page 6, under the head of the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, the following:

On account of transfers made to the Civil Service Commission a reduction is made, as follows: Chief of the board of examiners of rural carriers, \$2,250; one clerk, at \$1,600; one clerk, at \$1,400; three clerks, at \$1,200 each; two clerks, at \$1,000 each; eight clerks, at \$900 each, and two assistant messengers, at \$720 each.

Mr. LLOYD. Is that the same number?

Mr. LITTAUER. I believe that total, if my memory serves me right, is 18. Three of the 23 are already on the permanent force of the Civil Service Commission and the other 20 were details, and sending these 18 back would increase the force by 2.

Mr. LLOYD. And decrease the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. LITTAUER. And decrease the expenditures of the Government by \$2,250.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] a question. I would like the gentleman to state to the House as to what the necessity was for increasing the salary of the secretary of the commission from \$2,250 to \$3,000 a year.

Mr. LITTAUER. I think that he earns it as amply as any man in the Government employ earns \$3,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. The law now fixes his salary at \$2,250.

Mr. LITTAUER. The appropriation, the current law, is \$2,250. For years this has been asked from us by the commission. The high-grade men in this commission are the lowest paid of any in the employ of the Government. The commissioners themselves receive only \$3,500 a year, and this clerk is the practical man in this commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. How long has it been established by law that the salary of the secretary should be \$2,250?

Mr. LITTAUER. I am not informed, but I believe since the organization of the commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then it does not depend upon the current legislation; it has been fixed by the law that established the commission?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes; but Congress can change that law.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask how long this man has occupied this position with this same salary?

Mr. LITTAUER. He has been there since 1883—twenty-one years.

Mr. BARTLETT. At the same salary?

Mr. LITTAUER. At the same salary.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the time the Civil Service Commission was established.

Mr. LITTAUER. We were appealed to particularly because we understood the gentleman was married the other day and that he had lived along these twenty-one years on this low salary and that in the end Congress ought to recognize and grant to him his just deserts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether I am in time to make the point of order on the increase of this salary from \$2,250 to \$3,000? I will make the point of order anyway.

Mr. LITTAUER. Oh, I trust the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order now that the \$3,000 increase of salary is contrary to existing law, the existing law being that it shall be \$2,250.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is too late to make the point of order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then I offer to amend and propose to strike out the words "three thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two thousand two hundred and fifty," in accordance with the existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12 strike out "three thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two thousand two hundred and fifty."

Mr. LILLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the

gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] if he thinks this clerk could earn more than \$2,250 in any other job if he should lose this one?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do. I believe that he has shown such ability in the work that he has carried on there for many years.

Mr. LILLEY. Well, I do not.

Mr. LITTAUER. Well, that is a mere difference of opinion.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is well known to the House that the members of the Civil Service Commission usually continue in office but a brief time. This is one of the most rapidly changing commissions, in its personnel, in the service. The one man who has held steadily from the beginning up to this time and who knows the whole civil-service system more thoroughly than any other, upon whom the commissioners rely, as do all that have business to do with that commission, has been this man for whom an increase of salary is recommended.

He has served these twenty years or more and carried the burden oftentimes of the entire commission. From his acquirements, his fidelity, his long service, his thorough familiarity with the entire system, it is simply just that his salary be increased to this extent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to ask the gentleman before he takes his seat, as he is so familiar with the subject, would it not be well to strike out the three commissioners and let the clerk run this commission, and in that connection will the gentleman tell us if he knows why it is that gentlemen will very seldom remain on that commission?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Well, of course—

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is the matter with it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Just wait a moment, if you please. I am well aware that this is not a popular subject with some gentlemen in this House—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not a bit popular.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And has not been any time since I have been here. Every time the civil service or the commission has come up before the House it has been assaulted from one standpoint or another. I think, to be frank with the gentleman from Ohio, that there are some Members of the House not thoroughly in sympathy with the Civil Service Commission, and because of that lack of sympathy there is this disposition to levity, and sometimes, perhaps, to unjustly charge these gentlemen, who are the creatures of this House—public servants under law made by this House and in obedience to your behest undertaking to carry out their duties in your name. If by insinuation or otherwise we make it uncomfortable for them, or if we do not give them enough to justify a continuous service, it is our fault and not theirs; and here is a gentleman who has served faithfully through all these years of the changing personnel and politics of the commission, and is the one man above all others, as I understand it, who is simply indispensable in this service, and his salary ought to be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes 38.

Mr. BINGHAM. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, not a sufficient number rising in support of the demand therefor.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania a little while ago to say he intended to move to strike out this paragraph?

Mr. OLMSTED. I intended first to make the point of order against it, and, unless that carries, to move to strike out the entire paragraph under the caption of "field force" and also the one under the head of "rural-carrier examining board."

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. OLMSTED. Well, the paragraph has not been read yet.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; he is reading on the next paragraph, I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Which paragraph is it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Beginning on line 10, page 33, which has been read, has it not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that paragraph has been read.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the paragraph I move to strike out.

Mr. OLMSTED. That is the one I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 33, line 10, strike out all of line 10 down to and including line 24.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect that this motion will prevail. I do not believe that if it did prevail it will prevent this commission from getting their salaries, but it is the only way that I have here or any other Member will have, as long as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] is chairman of the Civil Service Committee I fear, to vote upon this question and to enter a protest against the whole system of alleged, pretended, civil-service reform as we have it. I do not want it understood that I am opposed to a proper civil service—a civil service based on proper examination and trial. I want one that will bring results in the way of an improvement in the way of civil service. I have had an opportunity to observe during the two periods—the old period of the “spoils system,” so called, and the new period of the “merit system,” so called—and I believe I can say with absolute sincerity, and I think that is true of the judgment of every man who has been permitted to observe those two periods, that the civil service of the United States is not being improved; that it is not as good as it was twenty years ago; that it is constantly deteriorating; that it is being every year more and more an expense and less and less efficient.

I want to enter my protest against it as it now exists, and I can not do it in any other way than this. If it came in such a way that I could vote to wipe it out—cut it out, root and branch, to get rid of all its pretenses, to do away with its deformity—I would gladly do it. But it seems that we can not have that opportunity. Therefore I take the only one that comes to me, that in the most positive way I can to denounce it as, in my judgment, a great mistake—a mistake almost amounting to a crime. We are creating in our midst a privileged class of people. We are preparing a way for a large pension list, an immense one. Gentlemen think that the danger is not upon them this moment, and therefore they seem to be unconcerned; but every man who gives thought to it knows that that is coming—that it must come in the interest of doing the public business of the people. In time to come there will be an army of inefficient men, made so by time, and I believe that instead of passively accepting this system as one that ought to be changed, it is the duty of men who know, the duty of men who have opportunity to observe, whenever they can and wherever they can to denounce it as insufficient to accomplish the purpose that men say they desire by a civil service. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say a word. I do not think it is necessary to debate the proposition made by the gentleman from Iowa. This House has heard it a great many times, and he himself admits that his proposition would have no force or effect; that it simply expresses a feeling; and no matter what we do, whether we strike it out or not, the law goes on just the same. It does not matter whether this particular provision goes through; it amounts to nothing whether we strike it out or leave it in, the law will still remain and the same salaries will be paid.

Now on the merits of the civil service, I differ absolutely from the gentleman from Iowa, and I believe the great majority of the people of this country differ from him. I believe that when he says the old “spoils system,” as he calls it, is better than the present system, he is grossly mistaken. I believe the present system is infinitely better in the service it gets for the country, in the men it brings in as clerks, and in the effect it has upon us as Members of Congress. I believe it has improved, and it will improve from year to year, and I think it will be free from much of the criticism which used to be made with so much force, and truth, I doubt not, about the examinations. The examinations are better, and the effect on the service is beneficial. Of course it is not a perfect system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman know that another system would be better than either the “spoils system” or this, which, I think he must grant must lead at least to a civil-service pension list? Does not the gentleman think that it would be better for the committee of which he is the distinguished chairman, I believe, to bring in a bill for a fixed period of public service? Let it be for five, seven, twelve, or fifteen years—that makes no difference; but let it be limited; let the time be fixed so that each man who holds a Federal appointment may know, just as a sheriff or clerk in one of our counties knows, that when a certain time comes he must go back to private life, and during the period of public life he may save his money so that when he goes back to private life he may go back out of debt and respected.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is a question which has been discussed in our committee. Personally, I do not believe that it is the remedy. I will admit of course that the pres-

ent system does tend to superannuation. There is a bill on the Calendar of this House that if it is passed will relieve that. There is a provision that when a man gets to be 70 years of age he shall leave the service. That prevents the danger of inefficient service the gentleman alludes to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But if the gentleman will excuse me, if you are going to wait until a man is 70 years of age before putting him out of the service he goes out helpless, and that is the objection to that scheme.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not think he ought to go out helpless. That is just it. In every other walk of life a man appreciates that he must lay up enough money as he goes along to keep him after he gets to be 70 years old.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, do our Federal officials appreciate that? Is it not a matter within the gentleman's own knowledge that they rely upon the hope of feeding at the public crib always, as a reason why they should not save a dollar? Does the gentleman from his Massachusetts district—I know of none from my section of the country—remember a single man who has ever gotten an office in Washington who ever entertained the idea of giving it up?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No; I think that we all of us, when we get here, want to stay. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Congressmen know that they are elected for only two years, and they know that there is a chance of going out at the end of the term, so that wise Congressmen, like the gentleman and myself, do not uselessly run in debt, and do not leave ourselves stranded as atoms upon the general surface of the oceanic occasion.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That may be true, but—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But these other people do. Now, don't you think it would be better to prescribe a term that would not run with the Presidential term—five or seven years—and at the end of that time let a man go out of office just as a sheriff or a clerk does?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. If the House will give me time, I will be glad to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's time will be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The same thing which the gentleman seeks by his five or four year term would be reached by the bill which is now on the Calendar; because if every clerk saw before him the necessity of going out of the service when he reached 70 years of age, then he would not have the feeling which the gentleman says they all now have, that they are going to feed at the crib forever. It seems to me that bill brings to bear upon a Government employee the same influences for saving as the gentleman's proposition, and it does not make what I think is the objection to a five-year term; it does not make a wholesale turning out of office. Now we are in a very different condition than we were even twenty years ago, when this act went into effect. Why there are 150,000 men now under the classified service; 270,000, I think it is, in the whole Government service. There are 150,000 men, according to you, who would have to go out every five years; I do not believe that is wise; but I do believe that if the bill which is now on the Calendar was enacted it would remedy that one defect in the law, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will excuse me—

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not mean by that that the whole office-holding class will go out at the termination of a particular five years.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. You mean one-fifth go out every one year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You might let one-fifth of them go out each year, and then when a man was reappointed he would go out five years after he was reappointed. Deaths and—I started to say resignations, but there would be none—deaths and removals for cause would bring about a different state of initiation into office, and in addition to that you could divide the general office-holding class into subclasses that would go out in different years.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. As I say, I do not believe that is the best remedy. I think the bill which is now on the Calendar, while I do not think it is best, would be a better method of curing it. But the question now, of course, is not what is the ideal method, it is not a question of improving the method. The question now is, Shall we simply show animosity to that whole system by emptily striking out this paragraph? I trust the committee will not do it.



Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, it would hardly be legal, constitutional, and satisfactory that this debate should take place and this paragraph be passed without myself embarking in the procedure of adding a little something to the hilarity of the annual occasion. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that this is a "puerile"—I think that was the word he used—

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No, excuse me; I did not use that word.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Some other word equally good, perhaps.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not remember the exact word.

A MEMBER. "Senseless."

Mr. GROSVENOR. "Senseless procedure." It is the gentleman from Massachusetts and gentlemen who have acted in his position before who have caused this "senseless procedure" annually.

I can tell you how he has succeeded, he and his predecessors, in doing it. The civil-service bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States twenty-one years ago, and passed. During the debate on its passage the Senator from Massachusetts whom we are now mourning the great loss of, while indorsing the general purpose, the apparent purpose, of the bill, stated in effect that it was crude and imperfect, and used the language, "It is a tentative measure in its present form." The author of the bill made no sort of claim that he was trying to reform the civil service, and frankly said that his purpose in introducing and attempting to secure the passage of the law was to bring about a division of public patronage in the very direction of these "spoils systems" which we have heard as the battle cry of reformers ever since.

The bill passed and went upon the statute book, and from that day to this I will say scores and hundreds of bills have been introduced into this House and into the Senate to amend, to change, to revise, to repeal, to enlarge, to strengthen, to weaken this measure. Not one of them was ever reported back to the body from which it emanated.

Now, if this was a popular measure, if it did not have to be guarded with a club in defiance of popular sentiment and popular right in the legislative body, why this procedure? Never during twenty years, I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, has there been a bill reported to this House from the committee that would furnish even the opportunity of amendment so as to change this original tentative measure. It has been legislated upon by Executive order. There is no question about that. If you want to find out where legislation by Executive order has come from, trace the whole procedure from the first President that has administered it down to the last one that has enlarged its operations.

In the Fifty-fifth or Fifty-sixth Congress a hundred Republican Members of the House met in a voluntary committee and a bill was drawn, not a spoils-system bill, but, in my judgment, a vast improvement on the present law, a bill that proposed terms of office for clerks below a certain grade. I think it was four years, perhaps, with the full opportunity to reappointment; but there was a long line of improvements that had been suggested to these 100 gentlemen because of the gross outrages, as we believed, that had been perpetrated under the forms and pretenses of civil-service reform and merit system. That bill was regularly introduced by Judge Evans, now on the United States bench, as a result of the concurrent action of the 100 Members of the House. It went to the committee, and it is there yet, as is every other bill that has gone there, with the possible exception of the one which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like five minutes more.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have the time desired.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time of the gentleman from Ohio is extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think the bill to which the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred is susceptible, under our parliamentary rulings here, of an amendment, and possibly we may have an opportunity to amend it when the time comes, if it ever should come, that the bill comes up for passage; but I am a little afraid that the gentleman will never call it up, or try to call it up, especially now that I have warned him that he had better look out or there may be nothing left of it when it comes to a passage except the enacting clause. Therefore I do not think he will be speedy and zealous in getting that bill before this House.

There has never been a time in the twenty-odd years of the life of this law that two-thirds of the Members of this House would not have voted to amend it if they could have had the oppor-

tunity. We have had no opportunity, and everybody has understood exactly why we have had no opportunity. The only opportunity we have had is to express our opinion, not foolishly but intelligently, that we should like to amend this law that was passed as an experiment, and which has proved not as efficient or valuable, it strikes me, as we could make it if we had the opportunity to work on it.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman from Ohio see to it that we have a special rule making that bill in order?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Ohio can not "see to" anything.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes, the gentleman from Ohio can see to many things, and see through a great many things. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will see to it that I vote for it, in conjunction with other members of the committee, if I have the opportunity. Now, that is about all I have to say. I think that this matter has gone mad—gone wild.

Now, think of the rural carriers. Just think of them, gentlemen! I had a formidable set of papers come to me this morning. I want to tell you what they were. A formal charge—or perhaps I ought to say a formal demand—was made by the Civil Service Commission, or gentlemen representing that Bureau—these great gentlemen, these thirty-five hundred dollar gentlemen—calling upon a poor fellow, a rural carrier, who is getting \$650 or \$700 a year, to answer the following questions:

Did you use your influence in behalf of the election of Roosevelt or some one else in the recent campaign in Ohio?

Is it true that you, on the day of the election, turned over your route to your substitute, and that you went to the election and worked at the polls?

Now, just think! We are paying \$40,000 or \$50,000 to have a Commission that can jump on a poor fellow, a carrier, and hold him up like that. There came to me a document signed by the postmaster of the town—the initial point—stating that the man was one of the most efficient carriers in that section of the country; that it was true that he occasionally sat around a store nights and talked politics a little, and that on the day of the election his child was violently sick with a throat disease and he was in attendance upon the child, under the care of a physician, but that he did go to the election and voted. And his physician certified to the same fact. Now, that man is held up by order of the Civil Service Commission. He is losing his pay. He is feeding his horses and he is not getting any pay for it, while a great body of men are investigating, not what is the matter with the woman who came from Cleveland and robbed everybody [laughter], but as to whether that man did vote for Roosevelt and whether he worked at the polls on election day. Now, that is all there is of it. I can refer any gentleman to the name and to the place and all the circumstances connected with it. When it was simmered down at home—I do not know what it will be when it is passed on here—and the fact was ascertained, it was discovered that a gentleman of the opposite political faith had threatened this man and tried to drag him away from his advocacy of Roosevelt, telling him that he would annoy him, and after the suspension took place this same man gave further notice that he was going after the postmaster in a few days. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. And he will probably get him, now that the election is over. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no doubt he will get him. Now, is it any wonder that we would like to have a brief opportunity to express our opinion upon propositions like that?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, there is but a limited number of Members present in the House at this time, and it is after 5 o'clock—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi rose.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the gentleman desire any time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to strike out the last word for about three minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the gentleman desire to postpone the rising of the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; just for a second.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield, with pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the interesting discourse of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. He always interests me and he always interests the House. I wondered, however, while he was talking if he could furnish us with such a hard-luck story out in Ohio because of a fellow who had shown political activity in the cause of Roosevelt, what might possibly have been the awful fate of one who dared show political activity in behalf of Parker. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. The indications are, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that there were a great many of them who were terrified during that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A great many; yes. Mr. Chairman, from the numerousness of their scarcity at the polls I imagine a great many of them must have been terrified [laughter], whether through the rural free-delivery service or in some other way I shall not undertake to say. But the gentleman has incidentally told us that if the Administration wanted to find out how a fellow voted who was a rural carrier that they might find out by charging him with having voted for the dominant party, trusting later on to get the desired information.

I have not risen, however, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of dwelling upon that feature of the discussion. I was a little bit afraid that something I myself had said would leave a wrong impression of my views upon this question. I think that the civil-service experiment has shown that the old spoils system, as it is called, was not perfect, and I do not think the people are prepared to go back to that system.

I am rather inclined to believe with the gentleman from Iowa, however, that it was equally as good as the Chinese system, which we now have. I would not go back, however, entirely to that. I believe that there ought to be an examination to determine whether men are competent or incompetent to hold these offices, but the difference between me and the civil-service men would be this: After having held an examination, after having required the men to get a very high average standing upon that examination, a standard higher than we now require, I would then leave the appointing power to select from the list of eligibles the men whom they wanted to serve the country in their respective Departments. I do not believe that a Republican Administration ought to be served by men, a great many of whom have at heart the defeat of Republican Administration. I do not believe that a Democratic Administration ought to be served that way. I do believe that the men ought to be entirely competent. I believe that they ought to be determined to be competent by public examination; that then the appointing officers ought to be left free to select from the list of eligibles the men who will contribute to the success of the governmental administration of the party in power with its policies. I believe, moreover, that a far more important thing than a man's competency in arithmetic and geography and general history is a man's character, his honesty, his integrity. I believe that the man who puts him in office is responsible for him, and that man ought to have some way of finding out not only whether he is acquainted with these various things upon which he is examined, but whether he is a man of good moral character and absolute integrity and loyalty and trustworthiness. Thus, having had determined his intellectual competency, to have the opportunity to examine into and determine his moral competency. At the same time I would have him serve one, or at the furthest, two terms fixed by law, just like your officers at home have fixed terms. Who here present will deny this proposition when I make it, that the average county sheriff and clerk are far more competent than the average man in office under the Federal Government at Washington? Is there anybody who will deny it? Not one who knows anything about it. I was afraid that the impression might be left that I thought that no examination was necessary at all. I do not believe that, and I wanted to explain that fact.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZEL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. There has been transmitted to the House a letter from the War Department calling attention to the fact that in Document No. 31, heretofore transmitted by mistake, a portion of the document was not transmitted and is now transmitted. This is the size of the original document. Without objection, therefore, Document No. 31 will be reprinted with the omitted matter now transmitted. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of

the St. Louis Hay and Grain Company against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assisant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John W. Spratley against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Savings and Trust Company, transmitting the annual report for the year ended December 1, 1904—to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting, with a favorable recommendation, a proposition for legislation in reference to seizure of live stock trespassing on Indian reservations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, submitting his annual report for the year 1904—to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the House, submitting an estimate of appropriation for deficiency in expenses of select committees—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Surgeon-General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14752) to change the name of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3016); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10683) granting a pension to William Lanier—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15267) granting a pension to Thomas C. Hughes—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15820) granting an increase of pension to James Smith—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 15969) for the apportionment of Representatives among the several States of the Union, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 15970) to amend section 1141 of the "Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 15971) to amend an act entitled "An act making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census"—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BROOKS: A bill (H. R. 15972) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Colorado Springs, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 15973) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Niles, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 15974) for the enlargement of the post-office building at Trenton, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 15975) to provide for a survey of the harbor at Galveston, Tex., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15976) to provide for a survey of the harbor at Galveston, Tex., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.



By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15977) appropriating \$100,000 for the completion and protection of the revetments of the banks of the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15978) appropriating \$50,000 for completion of public building extension at St. Joseph, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 15979) to dredge Horn Island Pass, in Jackson County, Miss., to a depth of 21 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 15980) to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 15981) to authorize the Mississippi Central Railroad Company to bridge Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 15982) extending the limit of time within which homesteaders may establish residence on locations under the Shoshone irrigation enterprise under the terms of the national irrigation act—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 15983) for the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15984) to provide for the erection of a monument at the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the Signal Corps of the United States Army during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BASSETT: A bill (H. R. 15985) authorizing the purchase or acquirement of land adjoining the Fort Hamilton Reservation, New York City, the improvement of the same, and the erection of new buildings at such fort—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 15986) creating the Colorado Cliff Dwellings National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 15987) to promote public education by giving free transmission through the mails to certain educational publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 15988) for the relief of certain homestead settlers in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 15989) to authorize Louis M. Tisdale to construct and operate a ship canal or channel from Mon Louis Island, Mobile County, State of Alabama, to the deep-water basin in Mobile Bay between Fort Morgan and Fort Gaines, Ala., through the lands and waters of the United States, and to grant to said L. M. Tisdale the right of way for that purpose—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 15990) for the further improvement of the propagation and distribution of valuable seeds, plants, bulbs, and so forth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 15991) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sharon, Mercer County, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: A bill (H. R. 15992) to provide for the construction of a light-house and buoy tender for the inspector of the third light-house district—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 15993) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the site for the public building at Natchitoches, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 15994) to provide for the erection of a municipal building in the city of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15995) to regulate the employment of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 15996) providing for the establishing of a Weather Bureau station at Del Rio, Tex.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 15997) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of Caseville Harbor, Michigan, on Lake Huron—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 15998) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the mainland of the United States of America and the Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 15999) appropriating the sum of \$10,000 for fencing Round Valley Indian Reservation, in the State of California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 16000) to enable the Department of Agriculture to continue its investigations and experimentations with reference to the cotton-boll worm, cotton-wilt disease, and root rot—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 16180) for a public building at the city Clarinda, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 165) authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inauguration of the President-elect on March 4, 1905, and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NORRIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) to amend the Constitution in regard to the term of President, Vice-President, and Members of Congress—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. BELL of California: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 167) directing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of engineers to report a project for restoring and maintaining the original navigable capacity of Sacramento River, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 168) determining the material of the public building at Cleveland, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of California: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 169) providing for examination, survey, and estimate of cost for improvement of the harbor at Mendocino, Cal.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) appropriating \$8,000 for the improvement of Petaluma Creek, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) directing the Secretary of War to make an examination, survey, and estimate of cost for improvement of Sonoma Creek, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) appropriating \$7,500 for the improvement of the Mokelumne River, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) directing the Secretary of War to make survey and estimate for improvement of Belvedere Harbor in San Francisco Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) appropriating \$3,000 for the improvement of Napa River, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) making appropriations for lower Sacramento River available for any navigable portion of said river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HITT: A resolution (H. Res. 388) to pay to the widow of David Wolfe Brown, late Official Reporter of Debates in the House, certain moneys—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CURTIS: A resolution (H. Res. 389) allowing chairmen of certain committees to appoint session clerks—to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 16001) granting an increase of pension to William I. Bastian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BADGER: A bill (H. R. 16002) granting an increase of pension to John Falkenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16003) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Messmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16004) granting an increase of pension to Granville M. Pearman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16005) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McKim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16006) granting an increase of pension to James Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16007) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Helwage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16008) granting an increase of pension to Absolum Borrer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16009) granting an increase of pension to William A. Grady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16010) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Elder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16011) granting an increase of pension to James E. Weingardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16012) granting an increase of pension to James P. Waldorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16013) granting an increase of pension to Letulius Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16014) granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Pritner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16015) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16016) granting an increase of pension to S. Harriet Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16017) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16018) granting an increase of pension to James R. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16019) granting a pension to Nancy Kern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16020) granting a pension to Leonard Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16021) granting a pension to Daniel Heintz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16022) granting a pension to James Falloon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16023) granting a pension to Martha A. McCloud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16024) granting a pension to Lewis Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16025) to correct the military record of William H. Feaster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16026) to correct the military record of Lyman D. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16027) to correct the military record of John Bolling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16028) to correct the military record of John Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16029) appropriating the sum of \$500 to pay services of Elizabeth Ballett as nurse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16030) for the relief of Capt. Wilson Strickler, Company C, Twenty-first Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16031) for the relief of Capt. Perry L. Miles—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 16032) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Hanlon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 16033) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16034) granting an increase of pension to Harrison W. Holman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16035) granting an increase of pension to Church Fortner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 16036) granting an increase of pension to Christian White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16037) granting an increase of pension to Sumner Barstow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16038) granting an increase of pension to Orrin L. Dake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16039) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Betts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16040) granting to the city of Boulder, in the county of Boulder and State of Colorado, certain lands for park purposes and for the preservation of the native trees on said lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 16041) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16042) granting an increase of pension to John E. Herriott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16043) granting an increase of pension to John H. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16044) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rawlins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16045) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Main—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16046) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Lahrman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16047) granting an increase of pension to Nat G. Barter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16048) granting a pension to Alpheus G. Snover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16049) granting a pension to Mary A. Cornell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16050) granting an honorable discharge to William Newman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16051) for the relief of William Mackey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16052) for the relief of Isaac Cogswell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 16053) granting a pension to Florence Emery Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16054) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 16055) for the relief of William J. Robertson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16056) granting a pension to Frances Kirtland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16057) granting a pension to William Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16058) granting a pension to Albert M. Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16059) granting a pension to Henry Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16060) granting an increase of pension to John Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 16061) granting a pension to John Creager—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16062) granting a pension to Solomon Smith, jr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 16063) granting a pension to Lydia A. Keller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASTOR: A bill (H. R. 16064) granting an increase of pension to John Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 16065) granting a pension to William H. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16066) granting an increase of pension to Chloe M. Hewitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 16067) granting an increase of pension to Ora P. Howland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 16068) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16069) granting a pension to Ashley R. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16070) granting a pension to Jane Plankington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16071) for the relief of Green Edmondson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 16072) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Barry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16073) granting an increase of pension to James B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16074) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Wetherell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 16075) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16076) for the relief of the heirs of Lucinda Muse Thomas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 16077) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 16078) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16079) granting an increase of pension to John Dammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16080) granting an increase of pension to Nelson L. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16081) granting an increase of pension to Alvin W. Avery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16082) granting an increase of pension to David P. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16083) granting an increase of pension to Isaac G. Denton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16084) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16085) granting an increase of pension to John M. C. Sowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 16086) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Burkholder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 16087) granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 16088) for the relief of Cooper Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 16089) granting a pension to Amanda Chatterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 16090) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Goodsell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16091) granting an increase of pension to William H. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16092) granting an increase of pension to Orvin P. Waterbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 16093) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Billings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 16094) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16095) granting a pension to Amanda E. Wagoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16096) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Sanduskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 16097) granting a pension to I. M. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16098) to correct the military record of W. H. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 16099) granting a pension to Lafayette Boutwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16100) granting a pension to James W. McCullah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16101) granting a pension to Robert J. Yeoman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16102) granting an increase of pension to John Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16103) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Ruess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 16104) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lanning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16105) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus B. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 16106) granting a pension to Frances Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16107) granting a pension to Robert Sewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16108) granting an increase of pension to A. S. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16109) granting a pension to Alice T. Groesbeck—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 16110) for the relief of Elizabeth A. C. Galloway—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16111) for the relief of J. H. Holland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JACKSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16112) granting a pension to Louisa Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16113) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Weis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16114) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Callow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16115) granting an increase of pension to John Klopfer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16116) granting an increase of pension to John Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16117) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16118) for the relief of the personal representatives of Peter J. Wise, late of Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16119) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 16120) granting a pension to Robert Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY: A bill (H. R. 16121) granting an increase of pension to Edward Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16122) granting an increase of pension to Ellen R. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16123) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 16124) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16125) granting an increase of pension to Eugene C. Moger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 16126) for the relief of Leroy Noble—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 16127) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Goodell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16128) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Toll—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKING: A bill (H. R. 16129) granting an increase of pension to John H. Pitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16130) granting a pension to Alice Rourke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 16131) granting an increase of pension to William W. Clift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 16132) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Seele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16133) granting a pension to Thomas J. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16134) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Stillwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 16135) granting an increase of pension to Bridget A. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16136) granting a pension to Louise S. McWhinnie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16137) granting a pension to Leocardia F. Flowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16138) for the relief of Mary Cairney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 16139) to provide an American register for the barkentine *Andromeda*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 16140) granting an increase of pension to Nelson A. Fitts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16141) granting an increase of pension to John Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 16142) granting an increase of pension to R. G. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16143) granting an increase of pension to William Sweet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16144) granting an increase of pension to George Kreigh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16145) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16146) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Joy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16147) granting a pension to Mary Murname—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 16148) granting an increase of pension to Matthew McKown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16149) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 16150) granting an increase of pension to Robert McAnally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 16151) for the relief of W. C. York—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHULL: A bill (H. R. 16152) granting a pension to Elmer E. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 16153) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sanford—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16154) granting an increase of pension to John G. V. Herndon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16155) granting an increase of pension to John H. Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16156) for the settlement of claims of volunteer soldiers by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 16157) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 16158) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Truit—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 16159) directing the Secretary of the Interior to inclose a return envelope with all pension vouchers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 16160) granting to Farwell, Ozmun, Kirk & Co. license to make excavations and place footings in the soil of certain land belonging to the United States at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16161) granting an increase of pension to Hart Echard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16162) granting an increase of pension to Charles Muller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 16163) granting an increase of pension to Nathan D. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 16164) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 16165) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16166) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 16167) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 16168) for the relief of Isaiah Heylin McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 16169) granting a pension to William H. H. Rock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 16170) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Wood—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Tarver—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Warren—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 16173) granting an increase of pension to Allen Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: A bill (H. R. 16174) granting an increase of pension to Malek A. Southworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 16175) granting an increase of pension to Merrick D. Frost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 16176) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 16177) granting an increase of pension to E. C. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16178) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Pautall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16179) granting an increase of pension to Mary Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Young People's Society of the First Church of the Covenanters of the City of Philadelphia, in favor of an international peace congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADGER: Papers in support of bill H. R. 10460, granting an increase of pension to George W. Recob—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. P. L. Marchant by granting her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of prominent citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, in behalf of a bill for a pension for James Mattingly, to accompany bill H. R. 4122—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of F. J. Edgar and others, of Eldorado, Iowa, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Farley, Iowa, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: Papers to accompany H. R. 15370, granting an increase of pension to Seth Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Resolution of Brooklyn Grange, No. 251, Maine, urging passage of bill H. R. 10765, establishing a Bureau of Public Highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers to be filed with bill H. R. 13932, granting an increase of pension to John L. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of various citizens, asking for the enactment of a law to prevent discrimination by common carriers of passengers traveling between States on account of color—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 15917, for the relief of Oliver P. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, held at St. Louis, Mo., October 28 and 29, 1904, in favor of enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the New England Tobacco Growers' Association, in opposition to any changes in the present Dingley law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Grand Camp of the Arctic Brotherhood, urging immediate legislation for an elective Delegate from Alaska—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, in relation to transportation charges by railway companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of heirs of Lewis Maukel, deceased, late of Knox County, Tenn., praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Petition in support of bill H. R. 9302, providing for untaxed denaturalized alcohol, signed by C. L. Kites, of Springfield, Mass.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Freeman G. Witherby, of College Hill, Ohio, late of the *Indianola*, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of citizens of Central Falls, R. I., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolution of Kalamazoo River Baptist Association, asking relief of distressing conditions in Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of W. S. Dassel and others, of Elberfield, Ind., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of the Epworth League and Christian Endeavor societies of Shenandoah, Iowa, for an international peace congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of locomotive engineers of Creston, Iowa, asking for pensions for engineers who served at the front during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: Petition of citizens of Montezuma County, Colo., favoring the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACKSON of Ohio: Papers to accompany claim of Martha B. Doty for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Kirkpatrick for relief by a special pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to John Klopfer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany claim of Daniel Callow for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany claim of Bertha Weis for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Louisa Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Peter J. Wise—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Windham, Greene County, N. Y., for the establishment of an interstate congress for the abolition of war—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of First Baptist Christian Endeavor Society of Pittsfield, Mass., praying for the establishment of an international peace congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of residents of Colrain, Mass., in favor of a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LILLEY: Papers to accompany claim of Mrs. Ellen



R. Graham for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for relief of William Smith, granting an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany claim of Edward Root, of Norton Heights, Conn., for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of protest from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mystic, Conn., against the classing of women with idiots, criminals, lunatics, and ignoramuses in a bill now pending before the House—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Connecticut Baptist Convention, indorsing the memorial to Congress of the Rev. T. S. Barbour—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of members of the Presbyterian Church of Malta, Saratoga County, N. Y., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of people of Cambridge and Somerville, Mass., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of West Somerville Baptist Church, of Somerville, Mass., for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, September 28, 1904, favoring the improvement of the army quarters at the Presidio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: Memorial of the Carnegie Steel Company, of Pittsburg, in favor of an exhibition of American railway appliances—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the people of Pittsburg, for a 9-foot channel in the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Westinghouse Air Brake Company, in favor of an exhibition of American railway appliances in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Matthew McKown, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for an increase of pension for Mrs. J. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Memorial of D. M. Hunter, to accompany bill H. R. 15880—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 15350, for the relief of George Taylor, alias George Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Grand Camp of the Arctic Brotherhood, urging immediate legislation for an elective Delegate in Congress from Alaska—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, for legislation extending the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of W. C. York, of Paris, Tex., for payment for property confiscated by the Union Army in Missouri in 1861—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHULL: Papers in support of House bill granting a pension to Elmer E. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Hugo, Ind. T., asking for the location of a United States court at their town—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Interstate Commerce Law Convention, in favor of enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to John Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 15952, for the relief of David B. Wacaser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 15953, for the relief of William T. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill granting an increase of

pension to Edward J. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of St. Paul and Minneapolis, in favor of a pension for veteran engineers during civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Petition of Interstate Commerce Law Convention, in favor of enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Interstate Commerce Law Convention, favoring enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the locomotive engineers of New York, asking pensions for veteran engineers who served at the front during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 14491, granting an increase of pension to Milton Selby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph W. Knight by granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Mrs. W. H. Tyler, president of the Woman's Home Mission Society of Worcester, Mass., in favor of a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Papers to accompany House bill for an increase of pension of Edward J. Dillon, Company G, Fourth New Hampshire Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYNN: Petition of Dr. N. A. Southworth, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 9, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, January 4, 1905.*

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move you, sir, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15895) generally known as the "legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill."

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULLOWAY. Under the rule for to-day bills on the Private Calendar are in order; but the Committee on Invalid Pensions have no desire to interfere here, and I ask unanimous consent that Monday next be substituted for the business in order to-day under the rule.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. It is impossible to hear.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that Monday next may be substituted for to-day for the Private Calendar, the consideration of pension business. Is there objection?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from New Hampshire that he alter the form of his request and make it so that it shall immediately follow the passage of this appropriation bill. It may be that you can take it up to-morrow.

Mr. SULLOWAY. But if you should occupy most of the day then we would not have time enough.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Georgia we can fix that easily then, should there be any trouble between the two conflicting interests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.